

Sargon's Threat against Jerusalem in Isaiah 10,27-32

I

Isaiah 10,27-32 continues to be a particularly difficult passage for interpreters of the book of Isaiah. The passage describes the invasion route followed by an anonymous enemy army approaching Jerusalem from the north, and it makes specific reference to a number of Judean sites, including the enigmatic *šemen*⁽¹⁾, Aiath, Migron, Michmash, Geba, Ramah, Gibeah, Gallim, Laishah, Anathoth, Madmenah, Gebim, and Nob. Although not all of these sites can be identified positively, scholars are reasonably certain that the invading army deviated from the main highway to Jerusalem from Beth-El in order to avoid the Judean fortress at Mizpah while still approaching Jerusalem from the north⁽²⁾.

The major problem in the interpretation of Isa 10,27-32 is its historical background. Although Judah suffered invasion by foreign armies on several occasions during the late-8th century, scholars have been unable to agree on the identity of the invader or the specific historical situation presupposed in this passage. Several proposals have been put forward, including Sennacherib's invasion of 701 BCE⁽³⁾, Sargon II's campaigns against the Philistines in 716

⁽¹⁾ See *BHS* note. Cf. B. DUHM, *Das Buch Jesaja* (Göttingen 1968) 103. Despite the many attempts to emend this text to a place name, the reading *mippenē šemen* must stand with the MT. The reference to "oil" in this passage apparently contributes to the portrayal of Assyria as an over-ripe olive tree in Isa 10,33-34, ready to be harvested by beating with a rod (cf. "Olive", *EJ* 12 1364-1366). For a full discussion of this text and the imagery employed therein, see my study, "Jesse's New Shoot in Isaiah 11: A Josianic Reading of the Prophet Isaiah", in the forthcoming *Festschrift* for James A. Sanders.

⁽²⁾ For reviews of research on this issue, see H. WILDBERGER, *Jesaja 1-12* (BKAT X/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1972) 423-435; D.L. CHRISTENSEN, "The March of Conquest in Isaiah X 27c-34", *VT* 26 (1976) 385-399.

⁽³⁾ W.F. BIRCH, "Sennacherib's Catastrophe at Nob, Isaiah x, 28-34", *PEFQS* (1891) 314-319; id., "Sennacherib's Catastrophe at Nob, Isaiah

and 712-711⁽⁴⁾, and the attack against Jerusalem made by the Syro-Ephraimitic coalition in 735⁽⁵⁾. Each of these proposals is beset by difficulties, however, prompting others to argue that the passage simply represents the prophet's visionary attempt to project a coming invasion⁽⁶⁾. Following a review of the proposed solutions to the historical setting of Isa 10,27-32 and the problems posed by these attempts, this paper proposes a new solution to the problem. Based on observations concerning the relation of Isa 10,27-32 to its literary context and Assyrian historical records pertaining to the reign of Sargon II, it argues that the historical background for Isa 10,27-32 may be found in Sargon II's western campaign of 720 BCE, in which he put down the revolt of a Syro-Palestinian coalition led

x, 28-32", *PEFQS* (1902) 197-198; A. JIRKU, "Die Zwölfzahl der Städte in Jes 10,28-32", *ZAW* 48 (1930) 230; Y. AHARONI, *The Land of the Bible* (2nd revised edition; London 1979) 393-394; cf. G. FOHRER, *Das Buch Jesaja I* (ZB; Zürich-Stuttgart 1966) 162-163; P. AUVRAY, *Isaïe 1-39* (SB; Paris 1972) 138-141; O. KAISER, *Das Buch des Propheten Jesaja Kapitel 1-12* (ATD 17; Göttingen 1981) 233-238.

(4) O. PROCKSCH, *Jesaja I* (KAT IX; Leipzig 1930) 175; WILDBERGER, *Jesaja 1-12*, 427; cf. R. E. CLEMENTS, *Isaiah 1-39* (NCBC; Grand Rapids-London 1980) 117-119; J. VERMEYLEN, *Du prophète Isaïe à l'apocalyptique I* (EB; Paris 1977) 267, n.1. For a discussion of problems pertaining to the date of Sargon's 712 campaign against Philistia, see H. TADMOR, "The Campaigns of Sargon II of Assur: A Chronological-Historical Study", *JCS* 12 (1958) 22-40, 77-100, esp. 92-94.

(5) H. DONNER, *Israel unter den Völkern* (VTS XI; Leiden 1964) 30-38; id., "Der Feind aus dem Norden. Topographische und archäologische Erwägungen zu Jes. 10,27b-34", *ZDPV* 84 (1968) 46-54; B. S. CHILDS, *Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis* (SBT 3; London 1967) 62; G. E. WRIGHT, *Isaiah* (LBC 11; Richmond 1964) 49; A. S. HERBERT, *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah 1-39* (CBC; Cambridge 1973) 88; J. H. HAYES-S. A. IRVINE, *Isaiah, the Eighth Century Prophet: His Times and Preaching* (Nashville 1987) 207-210; S. A. IRVINE, *Isaiah, Ahaz, and the Syro-Ephraimitic Crisis* (SBLDS 123; Atlanta 1990) 274-279.

(6) L. FÉDERLIN, "A propos d'Isaïe x, 29-31", *RB* 3 (1906) 266; G. DALMAN, "Palästinische Wege und die Bedrohung Jerusalems nach Jesaja 10", *PJB* 12 (1916) 37-57; W. F. ALBRIGHT, "The Assyrian March on Jerusalem, Isa. X, 28-32", *AASOR* 4 (1922-23) 134-140; G. B. GRAY, *Isaiah I-XXVII* (ICC; Edinburgh 1912) 206-207; J. SKINNER, *Isaiah I-XXXIX* (CBC; Cambridge 1905) 92-93; E. JENNI, *Die politischen Voraussagen der Propheten* (ATANT 29; Zürich 1956) 18, n.13; CHRISTENSEN, "The March of Conquest", 389-390, 395-399; H. BARTH, *Die Jesaja-Worte in der Josiazeit: Israel und Assur als Thema einer produktiven Neuinterpretation der Jesajaüberlieferung* (WMANT 48; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1977) 65-66.

by Yau-bi'di (Ilu-bidi) of Hamath and defeated the Egyptians at Raphia, thereby forcing the capitulation of Hannun of Gaza. In the course of his campaign, Sargon made a show of force against Jerusalem, thereby keeping Judah out of the conflict. Sargon's threats against Jerusalem on this occasion earned him the condemnation of the prophet Isaiah in Isa 10,5-34.

II

One of the more common solutions to the problem of the historical background of Isa 10,27-32 is to identify the invasion described in this passage as that of Sennacherib in 701. This position is adopted by Birch, Jirku, Aharoni, Fohrer, and Kaiser⁽⁷⁾. Although the invader is not identified in vv. 27-32, the literary context of these verses in Isa 10,5-34 comprises a condemnation of Assyria for overstepping its bounds in punishing nations on YHWH's behalf. A major feature of Assyria's arrogance appears in vv. 8-11 and 13-14 where the Assyrian king boasts about his power to overthrow cities and their gods⁽⁸⁾, such as Hamath and Arpad, threatening to do the same to Jerusalem and YHWH whom he equates with idols. This of course corresponds to the boasts made by the Rabshakeh speaking on behalf of Sennacherib at the siege of Jerusalem in Isa 36-37/2 Kgs 18,13-19,37 (esp. 36,13-20/2 Kgs 18,28-35; 37,8-13/2 Kgs 19,8-13). The major problem with this solution, however, is that Sennacherib did not approach Jerusalem from the north as described in Isa 10,27-32, but from the southwest. According to Sennacherib's own account of the campaign⁽⁹⁾, he led

⁽⁷⁾ See note 3 above.

⁽⁸⁾ For a discussion of Sargon's claims in relation to the speeches of Isaiah ben Amoz, see P. MACHINIST, "Assyria and Its Image in the First Isaiah", *JAOS* 103 (1983) 719-737, esp. 734-735, where he discusses the issue of Sargon's hybris in relation to Isaiah 10. Cf. C. COHEN, "Neo-Assyrian Elements in the First Speech of the Biblical RAB-SAQE", *IOS* 9 (1979) 32-48, esp. 44-45, who cites Lie *Sar* 42.269-279, in which Sargon claims that he was chosen by Marduk to conquer Babylon.

⁽⁹⁾ For translations of this text, see A. L. OPPENHEIM in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (ed. J. PRITCHARD) (Princeton ³1969) 287-288 (= *ANET*, 287-288); D. D. LUCKENBILL, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia - Part Two* (London 1989) 239-405 (= *ARAB*, II, 239-240).

his army down the eastern Mediterranean coast from Phoenicia to Philistia. After defeating the Egyptians in the plain of Eltekeh, Sennacherib took Eltekeh, Timnah, and Ekron, prior to advancing against the cities of Judah by way of the Shephelah. This corresponds to the notices in Isa 36,2.8; 2 Kgs 18,14.17; 19,8 that place Sennacherib in Lachish and Libnah during the siege of Jerusalem. Likewise, Sennacherib's palace inscription portrays him reviewing the booty at Lachish⁽¹⁰⁾. Auvray, Fohrer, and Kaiser attempt to sidestep this problem by claiming that Isa 10,27-32 represents Isaiah's prediction of Sennacherib's attack, but Donner demonstrates convincingly that the specific movements portrayed in this passage represent an actual attack, not a prophetic prediction⁽¹¹⁾. Consequently, Isa 10,27-32 cannot be connected to Sennacherib's invasion of Judah in 701.

A second major attempt at establishing the historical background of Isa 10,27-32 centers around Sargon's campaigns in Philistia during the years 716-711, especially against the revolt of Ashdod in 712-711. This position is adopted by Procksch, Cheyne, Wildberger, Clements, and Vermeylen⁽¹²⁾. It is based on the presence of the Assyrian army in the region during these years and the possibility that it would have passed through Judah on its way to Philistia. Unfortunately, there is no evidence from Assyrian or other sources that an Assyrian army advanced against Jerusalem or passed through Judah at this time. Other considerations further undermine this hypothesis. The first campaign in 716 does not seem to have been directed against a revolt by the Philistines or any other subject territory at the time. Rather, the aims of the campaign were commercial in that Sargon intended only to consolidate his hold upon the region and in order to open trade relations with Egypt⁽¹³⁾.

(10) *ANET*, 288; *ARAB*, II, 489.

(11) *Israel unter den Völkern*, 32-33.

(12) See note 4 above.

(13) A. ALT, "Neue Assyrische Nachrichten über Palästina", *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israels II* (München 1953) 226-241 (= *ZDPV* 67 [1945] 128-146); G. L. MATTINGLY, "An Archeological Analysis of Sargon's 712 Campaign Against Ashdod", *NEASB* 17 (1981) 47-64, esp. 47-48; cf. H. TADMOR, "The Campaigns of Sargon II", esp. 77-78; id., "Philistia under Assyrian Rule", *BA* 29 (1966) 86-102, esp. 91-92; A. SPALINGER, "The Year 712 B.C. and its Implications for Egyptian History", *JARCE* 10 (1973) 95-101; M. ELAT, "The Economic Relations of the Neo-Assyrian Empire with Egypt", *JAOS* 98 (1978) 20-34, esp. 28-30;

To this end, he established a trading post "on the border of the city of the brook of Egypt" under the supervision of the sheikh of Laban⁽¹⁴⁾. It is unlikely that Sargon would have threatened Jerusalem at this time as no revolt was in progress. The city of Ashdod did revolt against Sargon in 714-713, when Ahimetu, whom Sargon had placed on the throne of Ashdod in favor of his anti-Assyrian brother Azuri, was deposed by an anti-Assyrian commoner named Yamani⁽¹⁵⁾. The Assyrian army was hastily dispatched to put down this revolt. Although Yamani escaped to Egypt before the Assyrians arrived, the Egyptians handed him over to the Assyrians. Three Philistine cities, Ashdod, Gath, and Ashdod-Yam, were besieged during this campaign and their populations exiled⁽¹⁶⁾. Afterwards, Ashdod was rebuilt, resettled, and organized into an Assyrian province. Although this could provide an acceptable setting for Isa 10,27-32, insofar as Yamani attempted to persuade Judah, Moab, and Edom to join an anti-Assyrian coalition⁽¹⁷⁾, two major considerations speak against it. First, Assyrian records make no mention of a campaign through Judah. Second, Tadmor demonstrates on the basis of the Assyrian Eponym List that Sargon did not participate in this campaign at all, but sent his general or *turtanu* to direct the campaign while he remained behind to supervise construction on his palace at Dur-Shurukin⁽¹⁸⁾. This would correspond to the notice given in Isa 20,1 that Sargon sent his *tartān* to conduct the campaign against Ashdod⁽¹⁹⁾. These problems obviously undermine the position of

N. NA'AMAN, "The Brook of Egypt and Assyrian Policy on the Border of Egypt", *TA* 6 (1979) 68-90.

⁽¹⁴⁾ MATTINGLY, "Sargon's 712 Campaign", 47-48; TADMOR, "The Campaigns of Sargon II", 78; id., "Philistia Under Assyrian Rule", 91-92; NA'AMAN, "The Brook of Egypt", 71; ELAT, "Economic Relations of the Assyrian Empire", 28-30.

⁽¹⁵⁾ ALT, "Neue Assyrische Nachrichten", 234-241; TADMOR, "The Campaigns of Sargon II", 79-80; id., "Philistia under Assyrian Rule", 94-95; NA'AMAN, "The Brook of Egypt", 71.

⁽¹⁶⁾ See MATTINGLY, "Sargon's 712 Campaign", 47-64, for a review of the evidence.

⁽¹⁷⁾ See *ANET*, 287; *ARAB*, II, 193-195.

⁽¹⁸⁾ TADMOR, "The Campaigns of Sargon II", 92-94, 95-96.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Isa 10,5-19 can therefore not be associated with the Ashdod campaign. The portrayal of the Assyrian monarch's boasts in this passage

those who would maintain that Sargon's Philistine campaign of 712 provides the historical background for Isa 10,27-32.

A third proposal attempts to argue that the attack against Jerusalem in 734 by the Syro-Ephraimitic coalition constitutes the historical background of Isa 10,27-32. This argument is advanced by Scott, Donner, Childs, Wright, Herbert, Hayes and Irvine, and most recently by Irvine⁽²⁰⁾. It is predicated on the fact that the Syro-Ephraimitic attempt to besiege Jerusalem is the only documented invasion of Judah from the north in the late-8th century. But this proposed solution suffers from the absence of any internal evidence in this passage that the Syro-Ephraimitic coalition is the intended subject here. Furthermore, the literary context in Isa 10,5-34 explicitly identifies the Assyrian king as the party responsible for threatening Jerusalem. This proposal clearly depends on regarding Isa 10,27-32 as an independent textual fragment. Although there may be some grounds to question the literary integrity of Isa 10,5-34⁽²¹⁾, the primary basis for viewing Isa 10,27-32 as an independent fragment appears to be the inability of scholars to identify an Assyrian advance against Jerusalem from the north.

A final attempt at solution maintains that Isa 10,27-32 does not describe an actual invasion of Judah by a foreign army, but merely represents a prophetic vision of a projected invasion. This solution is advocated by Féderlin, Dalman, Gray, Albright, Skinner, Jenni, Christensen, and Barth⁽²²⁾. It clearly presupposes the inability of these scholars to identify a specific historical setting for the passage. But, as Donner points out, the detailed description of the army's movements and the use of perfect verbs in the text point to a description of an actual invasion of Judah by a very real army⁽²³⁾.

would conflict with the fact that Sargon remained in Assyria during this campaign.

⁽²⁰⁾ See note 5 above.

⁽²¹⁾ For full discussion of the problems in Isa 10,5-34, see BARTH, *Die Jesaja-Worte in der Josiazeit*, 17-76; VERMEYLEN, *Du prophète Isaïe*, 251-268; and the relevant sections of my forthcoming commentary, *Isaiah 1-39, with an Introduction to Prophetic Literature* (FOTL 16; Grand Rapids 1995).

⁽²²⁾ See note 6 above.

⁽²³⁾ *Israel unter den Völkern*, 32-33.

In sum, each of the proposed solutions for the identification of the historical background of Isa 10,27-32 presents serious difficulties. It is therefore necessary to reexamine the issue in order to present a new solution for the problem.

III

The key question therefore is whether or not it is possible to identify an enemy advance against Jerusalem from the north as the historical setting of Isa 10,27-32. A number of possibilities are rejected above, including an invasion by the Syro-Ephraimitic coalition in 734, Sargon's western campaigns in 716 and 712-711, and Sennacherib's invasion in 701. Likewise, there is no indication that either Tiglath-Pileser III or Shalmanezar V ever invaded Judah. Only one major possibility remains: Sargon's western campaign of 720. A number of factors indicate that this campaign provides the historical setting for Isa 10,27-32⁽²⁴⁾.

According to Sargon's Khorsabad Annals, the new monarch was faced with widespread revolt in the west during the second year of his reign, i. e., 720 BCE⁽²⁵⁾. Resistance in Syria centered around Yau-bi'di (Ilu-bidi) of Hamath who gathered the cities of Arpad, Simirra, Damascus, and Samaria together to face Sargon in battle at Qarqar. After Sargon defeated the coalition and restored order in the region, he then moved south to face the Egyptian who supported the rebellious Hannun (Hanno) of Gaza. Sargon reports that he

⁽²⁴⁾ For a reconstruction of Sargon's campaigns based on the Annals and other texts, see TADMOR, "The Campaigns of Sargon II"; cf. J. E. READE, "Sargon's Campaigns of 720, 716, and 715 B.C.: Evidence from the Sculptures", *JNES* 35 (1976) 95-104. For recent discussion of the impact of Assyria's campaigns on Israel and Judah during this period, see now N. NA'AMAN, "The Historical Background to the Conquest of Samaria (720 B.C.)", *Bib* 71 (1990) 206-225; J. H. HAYES-J. KUAN, "The Final Years of Samaria", *Bib* 72 (1991) 153-181. For a general overview of Sargon's reign with full bibliography, see A. K. GRAYSON, "Assyria: Tiglath-Pileser III to Sargon II (744-705 B.C.)", *The Cambridge Ancient History. Second Edition. Volume III. Part 2. The Assyrian and Babylonian Empires and other States of the Near East, from the Eighth to the Sixth Centuries B.C.* (ed. J. BOARDMAN et al.) (Cambridge 1991) 86-102, 762-764.

⁽²⁵⁾ For translations of the Akkadian text, see *ARAB*, II, 5; *ANET*, 285.

defeated the Egyptians under Re'u (= Sib'u)⁽²⁶⁾, captured Hannun and took him as a prisoner to Assur in chains, and destroyed the city of Raphia on the Egyptian border, carrying off 9,033 captives. Scholars generally agree that this was Sargon's first western campaign. Furthermore, Sargon appears to have begun the resettlement of Samaria at this time, not during the first year of his reign as he claims in his annals⁽²⁷⁾.

The itinerary of the invading army portrayed in Isa 10,27-32 may best be explained against the background of this campaign. The passage lists Aiath, Migron, Michmash, a pass generally identified as the Wadi es-Suwenit, Geba, Ramah, Gibeah, Bat-Gallim, Laishah, Anathoth, Madmenah, Gebim, and Nob as the areas affected by the enemy advance. Although not all of the sites can be identified positively, scholars agree that the approaching army comes from the territory of the northern kingdom of Israel and that it deviates from the main Beth-El to Jerusalem road in order to bypass the Judean fortress at Mizpah⁽²⁸⁾. This indicates that the enemy commander wished to avoid a protracted siege of Mizpah in order to approach Jerusalem with all due haste. Although many scholars assume that the passage describes a siege of Jerusalem, the passage merely indicates that the enemy force threatened Jerusalem from Nob with no indication of preparations for a sustained siege. Nob, present day Mt. Scopus, provides a commanding overview of Jerusalem and presents an enemy commander with the opportunity to display the full might of his army to the city's inhabitants.

These factors indicate a commander whose interests did not center around the conquest of either Judah or only Jerusalem; rather they indicate a commander who wished to demonstrate his power to do so in order to intimidate the people and king of Jerusalem/

⁽²⁶⁾ The old reading Sib'u is correctly read as Re'u. See R. BORGER, "Das Ende des Ägyptischen Feldherrn Sib'e=sô'", *JNES* 19 (1960) 49-53.

⁽²⁷⁾ TADMOR, "The Campaigns of Sargon II", 26-39; NA'AMAN, "The Historical Background", 218; HAYES-KUAN, "The Final Years of Samaria", 170. More recently, see B. BECKING, *The Fall of Samaria: An Historical and Archaeological Study* (SHANE 2; Leiden 1992), who supports Tadmor's argument that Samaria was conquered twice, first by Shalmanezar V in 723 BCE and second by Sargon II in 720 BCE.

⁽²⁸⁾ For discussion of the location of these sites, see DALMAN, "Palästinische Wege", 37-57; DONNER, "Der Feind aus dem Norden", 46-54; WILDBERGER, *Jesaja 1-12*, 429-430.

Judah⁽²⁹⁾. Such interests correspond to those of Sargon during his western campaign of 720. Following his defeat of the Syrian coalition at Qarqar, he would have to march south in order to deal with Hannun of Gaza and his Egyptian supporters. Most scholars assume that, like Sennacherib in 701, Sargon travelled by the coastal highway which would provide the quickest and most direct route to Philistia⁽³⁰⁾, but several factors speak against such a move. First, it would be too risky for Sargon to move his troops through the narrow passes along the coast just north of the Carmel range or by the city of Megiddo. In a situation of general western revolt, an opposing force could easily bottle up his troops at either point⁽³¹⁾, thereby giving the initiative to the rebels and prompting other uncommitted countries, such as Judah, Moab, Edom, and Ammon, to join the revolt. Sargon was apparently a usurper, and rose to the Assyrian throne against considerable internal opposition⁽³²⁾. Second, after having just defeated a Syrian coalition that included Damascus and Samaria, it would be in Sargon's interests to pass through both cities in order to secure his mastery over them and to replenish his forces⁽³³⁾. Third, with the prospect of facing the Egyptians, Sargon could not afford to leave his rear exposed to a potentially hostile Judah, which might be prepared to press claims over the territory of the former northern kingdom of Israel⁽³⁴⁾. It

(29) Cf. WILDBERGER, *Jesaja 1-12*, 428, who provides a similar interpretation but in relation to Sargon's campaign against Ashdod.

(30) E. g., HAYES-KUAN, "The Final Years of Samaria", 178.

(31) See AHARONI, *The Land of the Bible*, 50-52.

(32) See GRAYSON, *CAH* III/2 87-88 for a review of the evidence pertaining to Sargon's accession to the Assyrian throne. The so-called "Ashur Charter" provides an account of Sargon's accession that indicates extensive opposition to his rule (see *ARAB*, II, 132-135; H. W. F. SAGGS, "Historical Texts and Fragments of Sargon II of Assyria. The 'Assur Charter'", *Iraq* 37 [1975] 11-20).

(33) See Sargon's Display Inscription (*ARAB*, II, 55) where he lists the chariots, horses, and soldiers taken from the rebels in Samaria, Shinuhtu, and Hamath during the western campaign that followed his battle against the Elamites at Der. For a discussion of Sargon's incorporation of foreign military units into his army, see S. DALLEY, "Foreign Chariotry and Cavalry in the Armies of Tiglath-Pileser III and Sargon II", *Iraq* 47 (1985) 31-48.

(34) See IRVINE, *Isaiah, Ahaz, and the Syro-Ephraimitic Crisis, passim*, who maintains that Ahaz was interested in asserting Davidic claims over the territory of the former northern kingdom of Israel. Cf. M. A. SWEENEY,

would therefore be in Sargon's interests to pass through Judah before advancing against Gaza in order to keep Jerusalem out of the conflict. Although Sargon needed to move quickly against the Egyptians and Philistines, he could not afford to confront them without first securing his hold over Damascus, Samaria, and Jerusalem. This would be especially true following his failure to overcome the Elamites at Der immediately prior to his western campaign⁽³⁵⁾. At this point, Sargon was still a new and not entirely legitimate king; his subjects and enemies were watching carefully to see if he could maintain his hold on power.

Two major problems must be explained before this reconstruction can be accepted. The first is the Assyrian king's reference to the subjugation of Carchemesh in Isa 10,8-11. This text is frequently read in conjunction with Isa 10,27-32 and presents a plausible basis for establishing a setting. Here, the Assyrian king mentions six cities that stand under his authority, including Carchemesh, Calno, Arpad, Hamath, Damascus, and Samaria. Clearly, they serve as examples that illustrate his plans to subjugate Jerusalem as well. Four of the cities, Arpad, Hamath, Damascus, and Samaria, were subjugated by Sargon during his western campaign of 720⁽³⁶⁾. Sargon does not mention the conquest of Carchemesh until the fifth year of his reign, i.e., 717 BCE, at which time he deported its monarch Pisiri and settled a contingent of Assyrians in the city for its attempt to ally with Mita of the land of Muski against Assyria⁽³⁷⁾. If Carchemesh was only

"A Philological and Form-Critical Reevaluation of Isaiah 8:16-9:6", *HAR* 14 (1994) forthcoming.

⁽³⁵⁾ TADMOR, "The Campaigns of Sargon II", 38; HAYES-KUAN, "The Final Years of Samaria", 170-171. Such a move would also prevent Moab and Edom from entering the conflict on the side of Philistia. Moab and Edom became border territories at some time during the late-8th century (see W. HOROWITZ, "Moab and Edom in the Sargon Geography", *IEJ* 43 [1993] 151-156, who argues that the appearance of Moab and Edom in this text reflects the perceived border of the Neo-Assyrian empire in the 8th-7th centuries BCE). Both paid tribute to Tiglath-Pileser III (see *ANET*, 282; *ARAB*, I, 801) and might see participation in the Philistine revolt as a means to rid themselves of a potential Assyrian threat. By removing Judah from the conflict, Sargon would discourage Moabite and Edomite support for Philistia and enable him to act freely without fear for the security of his eastern flanks.

⁽³⁶⁾ *ARAB*, II, 5.

⁽³⁷⁾ *ARAB*, II, 8.

conquered in 717, this obviously presents problems for an attempt to identify Sargon's campaign of 720 as the historical setting of Isa 10,27-32, if Isa 10,5-19 is read together with this text. The proximity of Carchemesh and Calno to Arpad suggests that they could have been involved in the Syrian revolt of 720 and submitted to Sargon after the defeat at Qarqar, but hard evidence for such a view is lacking. In this regard, it is noteworthy that Sargon never mentions a conquest of Calno anywhere in his records. Although Arpad, Hamath, Damascus, and Samaria had recently been defeated by Sargon and had submitted to him, Calno and Carchemesh had long been subject to the Assyrian throne, having paid tribute to Tiglath-Pileser III as early as the third year of his reign in 742⁽³⁸⁾. This suggests that the governing principle for the choice of cities listed in Isa 10,8-11 was not that they were *conquered* by Sargon; rather that they were *subject* to him. The fact that the Assyrian king in Isa 10,8 refers to their kings as "my commanders" (*šāray*) supports such a view.

The second and decisive major problem is the documentation for Sargon's move against Jerusalem at this time. Although Sargon's Annals and the Display Inscription say nothing about a confrontation with Judah during this period⁽³⁹⁾, Sargon describes himself in the Nimrud Inscription as the "Subduer of the land of Judah (*mušaknis [matu] Iaudu*), which lies far away"⁽⁴⁰⁾. The Akkadian term, *mušaknis*, "subduer", a standard causative participle form from *kanasu*, is generally used in reference to the

⁽³⁸⁾ Tiglath-Pileser III's Annals refer to his subjugation of all of the cities or countries mentioned in Isa 10,8-11 beginning in the third year of his reign (742 BCE). See *ARAB*, I, 769, which includes Carchemesh, Aram (Damascus), and Arpad; *ARAB*, I, 770, which includes Judah (Jerusalem), Kullani (= Calno), and Hamath; *ARAB*, I, 772, which includes Aram (Damascus), Samerina (= Samaria), Carchemesh, Hamath.

⁽³⁹⁾ For a complete translation of the text of the Annals, see *ARAB*, II, 3-51. For the Display Inscription, see *ARAB*, II, 52-75.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ *ARAB*, II, 137. A translation of the entire text appears in *ARAB*, II, 136-138. For a transliteration of the Akkadian text and a translation into German, see H. WINCKLER, *Die Keilschrifttexte Sargons. Band I. Historisch-sachliche Einleitung, Umschrift und Übersetzung, Wörterverzeichnis* (Leipzig 1889) 168-173. F.E. Peiser's transcription and German translation of the Akkadian text appears in *Sammlung von assyrischen und babylonischen Texten*, vol. II (ed. E. SCHRADER) (Berlin 1890) 34-39.

imposition of Assyrian authority over a country, but it does not necessarily refer to military conquest⁽⁴¹⁾. This reference is second in a list of Sargon's accomplishments that preceded his restoration of Assurnasirpal's palace at Nimrud, including his supposed defeat of Humbanigash of Elam at Der, the subduing of the land of Judah, the conquest of Hamath and its king Yau-bi'di, victories over Kakme, the Mannans, Pisiris of Carchemesh, Shihuhtu and Kiakki of Tabal, Muski, the Mannans (again), Karallu and Paddiru, and the Medes. The list appears to be in a rough chronological order in that the Annals record these events as follows:

- Year 1: defeat of Humbanigash of Elam at Der;
- Year 2: defeat of Ilu-bidi (= Yau-bi'di) of Hamath at Qarqar;
- Year 3: campaign against the Mannans and their allies;
- Year 4: defeat of Kiakki of Tabal at Shihuhtu (vicinity of Muski);
- Year 5: defeat of Pisiris of Carchemesh and rebels in the land of Kakme;
- Year 6: defeat of the Mannans (vicinity of Paddiru), Assur-li'u of Karalla, tribute from the Medes;
- Year 7: defeat of rebels in the Mannan land, subjugation of the Medes;
- Year 8: campaigns against the Mannans and Medes.

The order of events differs somewhat from that of the Nimrud Inscription, in that the defeat of Kiakki of Tabal precedes that of Pisiris of Carchemesh. Likewise, the Annals do not mention the subjugation of the land of Muski, although it is in the vicinity of Tabal, nor do they mention the conquest of Paddiru, although it was located in the vicinity of the Mannans. Despite these discrepancies, it is nevertheless clear that the list of Sargon's accomplishments follows a rough chronological order. It would appear likely that Sargon's subduing of the land of Judah would have taken place

(41) See "*kanasu 7*", *CAD* 8, 147; cf. TADMOR, "The Campaigns of Sargon II", 38, n. 146; BECKING, *The Fall of Samaria*, 55. See also the text a ND 3411, line 24 (C.J. GADD, "Inscribed Prisms of Sargon II from Nimrud", *Iraq* 16 [1954] 173-201, esp. 200), in which Sargon describes himself as the "subduer of the distant Medes" (*mušaknis [mat]madaa ruqūti*). There is no indication of a battle between Sargon and the Medes. In keeping with Tadmor's understanding of the term, it likely refers to the imposition or collection of tribute.

relatively early in his reign, between his first and second year. This would support the reconstruction put forward above, that Sargon advanced against Judah during the course of his western campaign of 720 against the Syrian coalition led by Yau-bi'di of Hamath and the Egyptian-Philistine alliance centered around Hannun of Gaza. Such an advance would constitute a show of force, intended to threaten and intimidate Judah, but it would not necessarily require a full siege⁽⁴²⁾.

IV

In conclusion, it appears that the historical setting of the enemy threat against Jerusalem described in Isa 10,27-32 may be found in Sargon's western campaign of 720 BCE. Following the defeat of the Syrian rebels at Qarqar, it would be necessary for Sargon to secure his hold over the Syro-Palestinian corridor prior to confronting the Egyptians and Philistines at Raphia. This provided an opportunity for the new king to demonstrate his authority over the land of Judah, which would be especially important following the defeat of Samaria and its incorporation into the Assyrian empire. A threat against Jerusalem at this time would be especially significant for defining the perspective of the prophet Isaiah. Although the prophet viewed the Assyrian army as an instrument employed by YHWH to punish Israel (cf. Isa 5,8-30; 9,7-10,4), Sargon's threats against Jerusalem, the city of YHWH's Temple and the Davidic dynasty, would prompt him to condemn the Assyrian monarch for overstepping his bounds and for failing to recognize YHWH as the source of his victories (cf. Isa 10,5-19.33-34). Insofar as recent research demonstrates Isaiah's generally positive evaluation of Ahaz and the Davidic dynasty⁽⁴³⁾, such a move would deny the Davidic monarch the opportunity to reassert authority over the former

(42) Cf. TADMOR, "The Campaigns of Sargon II", 38, n.146, who likewise argues that the reference to Sargon as "subduer of the land of Judah" in the Nimrud Inscription must presuppose an advance against Judah in 720 BCE; cf. A. K. GRAYSON, "Sargon", *ABD* V, 984-985, who maintains that the Assyrian army marched through Israel and Judah on its way to Gaza in 720 BCE.

(43) IRVINE, *Isaiah, Ahaz, and the Syro-Ephraimitic Crisis*; J. HØGENHAVEN, *Gott und Volk bei Jesaja: Eine Untersuchung zur biblischen Theologie* (ATD 24; Leiden 1988).

northern kingdom of Israel. Although Isaiah had argued that the Assyrians represented YHWH's instrument of punishment against northern Israel, Sargon's treatment of Judah as a vassal rather than as a partner provided the basis for Isaiah's condemnation of the Assyrian monarch in Isaiah 10⁽⁴⁴⁾.

School of Theology
at Claremont
1325 N. College Ave.
Claremont, CA 91711 USA

Marvin A. SWEENEY

SOMMAIRE

Les exégètes ont rencontré nombre de difficultés dans leurs tentatives d'identifier l'«ennemi» qui approche Jérusalem par le nord en Is 10,27-32. En fait, l'analyse de l'itinéraire suivi par l'«ennemi» selon Is 10,27-32, les annales des campagnes militaires assyriennes vers l'ouest à la fin du 8^{me} siècle A.C.N. et les objectifs tant politiques qu'économiques de ces opérations sont autant d'éléments qui démontrent que l'avance de cet «ennemi» doit être mise en relation avec l'expédition de Sargon II en 720 A.C.N. Après avoir vaincu au cours de celle-ci Hamath et Semaïre, Sargon II se dirigea vers le sud pour faire face aux Égyptiens. Comme il était pressé par le temps et qu'il désirait assurer son flanc oriental, il lui fallut avancer vers Jérusalem en venant par le nord, non pour mettre le siège à la ville, mais pour intimider son roi et ses habitants et ainsi empêcher Juda d'entrer dans le conflit aux côtés de l'Égypte et de la Philistie. L'arrogance avec laquelle Sargon II menaça Jérusalem incita Isaïe à condamner les Assyriens.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ Earlier versions of this paper were read at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Kansas City, Missouri, November 23-26, 1991, and at the Annual Meeting of the American Oriental Society, Cambridge, Massachusetts, March 29-April 1, 1992. I would like to express my appreciation to the University of Miami, which provided support for various aspects of this study, and to Dr. Wayne Horowitz of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, who read an earlier draft of this paper. Of course, he is not to be held responsible for the interpretations advanced here. I would also like to thank the W.F. Albright Institute for Archaeological Research, Jerusalem, Israel, which provided me with the resources to complete the final version of this paper during my appointment as the 1993-94 Dorot Research Professor.

The Faith of Martha and Mary

A Narrative Approach to John 11,17-40

The following article will limit its attention to the respective roles of the two women in the Johannine story of the raising of Lazarus, reported in John 11,1-54. However, in order to situate their story, I suggest the following overall structure for the narrative⁽¹⁾:

1. Vv. 1-6: Introduction

At “the place where John had first baptised” (see 10,40; 11,6), the reader meets: Lazarus, Mary, Martha, Jesus, and the disciples of Jesus. The only characters not introduced, who play a role in the subsequent story, are “the Jews”. But the presence of πολλοί in 10,41-42 indicates that there are others with Jesus “in the place where he was” (11,6). The reader also meets some of the major themes of chs 11-12: the theme of illness and death (see vv. 1, 4); the enigma of Jesus’ love which leads him to delay his departure (v. 6); Mary did something significant to Jesus (v. 2); the familiarity and union of affection between Jesus and the members of this family from Bethany (v. 5). Most importantly, however, the reader learns that the glory of God and the glorification of the Son of God will result from this illness which is not unto death (v. 4).

2. Vv. 7-16: Two Decisions are Made

Jesus decides to go to Judea, and he motivates his decision (vv. 7-15). Thomas, in the name of the disciples, decides that they should go up to Jerusalem with Jesus, even if they must die with him (v. 16).

3. Vv. 17-27: Jesus’ Encounter with Martha

Jesus reveals himself as the resurrection and the life (see vv. 25-26), but he is *misunderstood* by Martha as a miracle worker (see vv. 21-22), and in terms of the expected Jewish Messiah (v. 27).

4. Vv. 28-37: Jesus’ Encounter with Mary and “the Jews”

Mary responds to the voice of Jesus in a way which surpasses the misunderstanding of her sister (vv. 28-32). Jesus reveals profound emotion as Mary’s tears join those of “the Jews” (see vv. 33-35) who regard him as a failed miracle worker.

⁽¹⁾ See A. MARCHADOUR, *Lazare. Histoire d’un récit. Récits d’une histoire* (LD 132; Paris 1988) 73-90. I differ from Marchadour only on his placement of v. 38.

5. *Vv. 38-44: The Miracle*

At the tomb (v. 38), in the face of further misunderstanding (see vv. 39-40), Jesus calls Lazarus forth from the grave so that the doubting, incredulous and misunderstanding characters in the story might believe that he is the sent one of God (see vv. 40, 42).

6. *Vv. 45-54: The Decision of "the Jews"*

The leaders of "the Jews" decide that Jesus must die (vv. 47-50), and the narrator explains further the implications of that death (vv. 51-52). Jesus and his disciples go to Ephraim (vv. 53-54).

This schematic arrangement of the unfolding story indicates my conviction that whatever the prehistory of John 11 may have been⁽²⁾, there is a carefully articulated narrative design which determines the shape and message of John 11, and links it intimately with John 12⁽³⁾. It is universally accepted that Martha is the major figure, coming to a solemn confession of faith (11,27), which matches the stated purpose of the author at the end of the Gospel (see 20,31). A close reading of the narrative, within the overall story as I have outlined it above, suggests that the reader of the Gospel might come to a different conclusion⁽⁴⁾. Presupposing a great deal about the earlier parts of the narrative, I will trace the reader's impressions as the two women meet Jesus, and Jesus responds to them.

⁽²⁾ It is impossible to survey the many suggestions which have been proposed for the prehistory of this text. For good surveys, see MARCHADOUR, *Lazare*, 33-63; J. KREMER, *Lazarus, die Geschichte einer Auferstehung. Text, Wirkungsgeschichte und Botschaft von Joh 11:1-46* (Stuttgart 1985) 82-109, and G. ROCHAIS, *Les récits de résurrection des morts dans le Nouveau Testament* (SNTSMS 40; Cambridge 1981) 113-134.

⁽³⁾ I argue this case in detail in a volume at present in preparation with Fortress Press: *Signs and shadows. Reading John 5-12*.

⁽⁴⁾ By "the reader" I primarily intend the heuristic device of the emerging reader in the text (generally called "the implied reader" by narrative critics). There is, however, a close relationship between the reader *in the text* and the reader *of the text*. On this, see F.J. MOLONEY, *Belief in the Word: Reading John 1-4* (Minneapolis 1993) 9-21.

I. Verses 17-27: Jesus and Martha

On Jesus' arrival at Bethany, he finds that Lazarus has been in the tomb for four days (v. 17)⁽⁵⁾. The indication of time informs the reader, from the start, that Lazarus is long dead, and that his entombed body is in a state of advanced decay. The narrator next informs the reader of the proximity of Bethany to Jerusalem: the distance was about fifteen stadia (3 kilometers) (v. 18). Three issues lie behind this information. In the first place, it makes the next piece of information — that "the Jews" from Jerusalem came out to console the two sisters on the loss of their brother (v. 19)⁽⁶⁾ — a genuine possibility. Secondly, the reader senses that the city, well known as the *place of Jesus' passion and death* is nearby. Finally, the increasing hostility of chs 5-10, the presence, however innocent, of "the Jews", and the turn towards the theme of death in vv. 2, 4, 8 and 16, lead the reader to wonder if the *time of Jesus' passion and death* is near at hand⁽⁷⁾. Having set the scene, the narrator reports the encounter between Jesus and Martha and the ensuing dialogue (vv. 20-27). Although the initial message to Jesus, announcing that Lazarus was ill, came from both the sisters (see v. 3: ἀπέστειλαν οὖν αἱ ἀδελφαὶ πρὸς αὐτόν), there is a careful separation of the two

(5) It is sometimes suggested that the clumsy Greek of v. 17: ἐλθὼν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εὗρεν αὐτόν, looks forward to Mary Magdalene and the disciples' not finding Jesus in the tomb (see 20,1-10). See, for example, KREMER, *Lazarus*, 63; B. BYRNE, *Lazarus. A contemporary reading of John 11:1-46* (Zacchaeus Studies: New Testament; Collegeville 1991) 47.

(6) The use of the verb παραμυθεῖσθαι, used here to describe the actions of "the Jews", is rarely used in the NT (see v. 31; 1 Thess 2,11; 5,14). It is a word of wide meaning (see LSJ 1318, s.v.), but there is no cause to suspect the genuineness of the care shown to the bereaved family, or to read the use of this verb as describing non-Christian concern over death. See C. K. BARRETT, *The Gospel according to St John* (London 1978) 394.

(7) While it is true that "the Jews" in 11,8.19.31.33.36.45.54 do not play the negative role which has marked their appearance in the story thus far (see KREMER, *Lazarus*, 64), the reader comes to John 11 with their overall negative response well established. However benign they may be to other characters in the story (see vv. 19, 31: Martha and Mary), "the Jews" will continue to be divided by the presence of Jesus, and reject him (see vv. 8, 33-37, 45-46, 54). This is not to deny the possibility that John 11 came from a source which was more friendly to "the Jews" as many (e.g. R. E. BROWN, *The Gospel according to John* [2 vols.; AB 29-29a; Garden City, NY 1966, 1970] I,427-428) would maintain.

women. Martha moves into action, as she goes out to meet Jesus (ἔρχεται ὑπήνησεν αὐτῷ). Mary, on the other hand, is described as stationary, seated (ἐκαθέζετο) in the house (v.20)⁽⁸⁾. The two women will respond to Jesus in different ways, and this is marked for the reader as soon as Martha and Mary begin to take an active role in the story.

The words of Martha to Jesus, repeating the earlier respectful but warm salutation Κύριε (see vv. 3, 21), express genuine belief that Jesus' presence would have saved Lazarus. Martha has no hesitation in confessing her faith in Jesus as a miracle worker. She has no doubt that Jesus' presence would have healed Lazarus of his fatal illness (v. 21). She also gives her reason for such faith: Jesus has an authoritative access to God. Whatever he might ask of God — even now — will happen (v.22)⁽⁹⁾. But the reader is by now suspicious of such an understanding of Jesus. The narrator has criticised the faith of those who believed in Jesus because of the signs which he did (see 2,23-25), and Jesus has expressed dissatisfaction with the miracle faith of Nathanael (1,49-51), Nicodemus (3,1-11), the Samaritan woman (4,25-26) and the crowds beside the lake (6,25-27). During the feast of Tabernacles, among the false suggestions made about the person of Jesus, many people suggested that he was the messianic miracle worker (see 7,31). The man born blind was gradually led beyond the recognition of Jesus as a miracle worker (see 9,11.17.25-32) to belief in the Son of Man whom he could see and hear (see 9,35-38)⁽¹⁰⁾. Both Nicodemus (see

⁽⁸⁾ This is often noticed (e.g. R. BULTMANN, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* [Oxford 1971] 401, n.4), but scholars give all the credit to Martha, and portray Mary as behaving as one would expect from a grieving person (see, for example, BROWN, *John*, 1:433; X. LÉON-DUFOUR, *Lecture de l'évangile selon Jean* [3 vols; Paris 1988, 1991, 1993] II,416-417; MARCHADOUR, *Lazare*, 118-119). The reader, already warned of the importance of Mary in the prolepsis of v. 2, will read it differently.

⁽⁹⁾ A link is sometimes made between these words of Martha and the Mother of Jesus to the servants in 2,5. See, for example, KREMER, *Lazarus*, 65. The Mother's openness to the word of Jesus and Martha's trust in his miracle working capacities are quite different. J.H. BERNARD, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St John* (2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh 1928) 2:385, rightly warns against making too much of the use of the verb αἰτεῖν in reference to the prayer of Jesus (see Matt 7,7).

⁽¹⁰⁾ See F.J. MOLONEY, *The Johannine Son of Man* (BibScRel 14; Rome 1978) 142-159.

3,2) and the man born blind (see 9,31-33) had expressed their belief that Jesus had special access to God, and was able to work miracles because of this authority⁽¹¹⁾. But in neither case was their commitment to Jesus unconditional. Martha repeats their understanding of Jesus, well expressed by Nicodemus, that Jesus is a Rabbi from God who does wonderful signs because God is with him (see 3,2)⁽¹²⁾. As with Nathanael, Nicodemus, the Samaritan Woman, the crowds at the feast of Tabernacles, and the man born blind, Jesus' words to Martha must be understood as a correction of her misunderstanding⁽¹³⁾. Jesus begins his response to Martha by informing her that her brother would rise again (11,23). The reader knows that Jesus will be responsible for this rising, and that it would take place within the context of this visit to Bethany. The reader recalls that Jesus has already informed his disciples that Lazarus is asleep, and that he was going to Bethany "to awake him out of his sleep" (v. 11)⁽¹⁴⁾. Martha was not present at that earlier conversation, held on the other side of the Jordan with his disciples (see 10,40), but she does not allow Jesus any space to explain what he means; she knows (v. 24a: οἶδα ὅτι). She immediately intervenes with her own confession of belief in what was becoming an accepted Jewish understanding of a final resurrection (v. 24)⁽¹⁵⁾. Belief in "the last day" seems to have its roots in the OT (see Isa 2,2; Mic 4,1), and the idea of a final resurrection was a constituent part of

(11) R. SCHNACKENBURG, *The Gospel according to St John* (3 vols.; HTCNT IV/1-3; London-New York 1968-82) 2:329, notes that "the idea is in accord with Jewish piety".

(12) See MOLONEY, *Belief in the Word*, 108-109. Against B.F. WESTCOTT, *The Gospel according to Saint John* (London 1908) 168; BULTMANN, *John*, 401-402, and MARCHADOUR, *Lazare*, 119, who regard Martha's words in v. 22 as already a satisfactory expression of Johannine faith. For a correction of this view, see G.R. BEASLEY-MURRAY, *John* (WBC 36; Waco 1987) 190.

(13) See especially D.A. CARSON, *The Gospel according to John* (Grand Rapids 1991) 412.

(14) R.H. LIGHTFOOT-C.F. EVANS (ed.), *St John's Gospel* (Oxford 1956) 221, misses this by suggesting that Jesus is comforting Martha by reminding her of the Jewish hope of resurrection. See also C.H. TALBERT, *Reading John. A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles* (London 1992) 173.

(15) The abruptness of Martha's response is noted by KREMER, *Lazarus*, 66. See also E. HAENCHEN, *John 1-2* (2 vols; Hermeneia; Philadelphia 1984) 2:62.

Pharisaic Judaism (see Dan 12,1-3; 2 Macc 7,22-24; 12,44; Acts 23,8; Josephus, *War* II,163; *Sanhedrin* 10,1; *Sotah* 9,15; *Berakoth* 5,2. See also Mark 12,18-27 parr.)⁽¹⁶⁾. This is the faith expressed by Martha, *she tells Jesus* what resurrection means.

Jesus does not allow his friend to remain in her partial understanding of resurrection. She, like so many people in the story so far, is only prepared to believe those things which form part of her history and culture. A never-ending conflict seems to exist between the horizontal perspective of the actors in the drama (the disciples, "the Jews", Nicodemus, the Samaritan woman, the blind man at Bethesda, the crowd, Jesus' brothers, Jerusalemites) and the vertical inbreak of the one who tells the story of God (see 1,18). Jesus must wrest the initiative from the energetic Martha. In his ongoing attempt to lead Martha from a partial truth into the full truth, Jesus utters words which transcend traditional eschatological expectation, and centre upon his person as the resurrection and the life (v. 25)⁽¹⁷⁾. In a solemn ἐγώ εἰμι statement, Jesus points to the essential nature of belief in him as the only way to resurrection and life (vv. 25-26). Despite the solemnity of the words of Jesus, the reader is not surprised by his claims. The heart of this self-revelation of Jesus to Martha has already been made clear for the reader in 5,19-30⁽¹⁸⁾. There, as here, Jesus states that faith in him brings life both now and hereafter. Commentators have differed in their understanding of the possible meaning (physical or spiritual?) of "life" in the expression "and whoever lives" (11,26a: καὶ πᾶς ὁ

⁽¹⁶⁾ For a detailed discussion of these issues, see H.C. CAVALLIN, "Leben nach dem Tod im Spätjudentum und frühen Christentum", *ANRW* II, 19/1 (1979) 240-345.

⁽¹⁷⁾ The words καὶ ἡ ζωὴ are missing from some good witnesses (P45, Old Latin [Vercellensis], Sinaitic Syriac, Cyprian, and sometimes by Origen). BROWN, *John* 1:425, claims that its omission is harder to explain than its addition. BARRETT, *St John*, 396, suspects that the shorter text may be original, but "makes little difference to the sense". This is hardly the case, given the play on ζωὴ in vv. 25b-26. On this, see C.H. DODD, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge 1953) 364-365, and A. STIMPFLE, *Blinde sehen. Die Eschatologie im traditions-geschichtlichen Prozess des Johannesevangeliums* (BZNW 57; Berlin 1990) 109.

⁽¹⁸⁾ See, among many, BARRETT, *St John*, 395-396, and especially J.H. NEYREY, *An Ideology of Revolt. John's Christology in Social-Science Perspective* (Philadelphia 1988) 81-92.

ζῶν)⁽¹⁹⁾. The blending of realised and traditional eschatology, familiar to the reader from 5,24-29 (see also 6,40.54), returns. People die physically (11,25b), but faith in Jesus ensures a life which transcends death. Thus, Jesus insists that faith in him produces a spiritual life both now and hereafter. Jesus' words claim: the believer, even if he dies physically, will live spiritually (v.25)⁽²⁰⁾. The believer who is alive spiritually will never die; the believer on this side of death lives in the spirit (see 3,6; 5,24-25), and the one who believes in him now will live on the other side of physical death (see 5,28-29; 6,40.54)⁽²¹⁾. A clear indication that Martha needs to be corrected, and that Jesus is attempting to maintain the initiative in this dialogue, is found in Jesus' blunt question: πιστεύεις τοῦτο; (11,26b)⁽²²⁾.

The context of a discussion between Martha and Jesus, where two people who have contrasting ideas about the true meaning of resurrection, must determine the meaning of Martha's response. The reader has noticed that she fell short of true faith in Jesus in v.21, where she expressed her confidence in him as miracle worker. She then attempted to tell Jesus the meaning of resurrection (v.24), and again fell short of the mark. Her final response to Jesus, after his pointed question concerning her belief in him as the resurrection and the life does not answer Jesus' question. She claims that she has believed for some time (v.27a: ἐγὼ πεπίστευκα). The use of the personal pronoun and perfect tense of the verb must be given their full weight. Martha is expressing her long held convictions. In the past she (ἐγὼ) came to believe (πεπίστευκα) in Jesus, and she still retains that faith⁽²³⁾. This suggests to the reader that Jesus' self-revelation of vv. 25-26 has not changed her understanding of Jesus nor her faith in him.

⁽¹⁹⁾ For a summary of the discussion, see BROWN, *John* 1,425; BEASLEY-MURRAY, *John*, 190-191. On "life" and "eternal life" in the Fourth Gospel, see J.G. VAN DER WATT, "The Use of ΑΙΩΝΙΟΣ in the Concept ΖΩΗ ΑΙΩΝΙΟΣ in John's Gospel", *NT* 31 (1989) 217-228.

⁽²⁰⁾ See BROWN, *John*, 1:425. For an existentialist reading of these words as "rising into life" through faith, see BULTMANN, *John*, 402-403.

⁽²¹⁾ The question of physical life and death was important in the Johannine Community. See STIMPFLÉ, *Blinde sehen*, 111-116. See also S. M. SCHNEIDERS, "Death in the Community of Eternal Life. History, Theology and Spirituality in John 11", *Int* 41 (1987) 46-52; J.P. MARTIN, "History and Eschatology in the Lazarus Narrative", *SJT* 17 (1964) 332-343; B. MCNEIL, "The Raising of Lazarus", *DRev* 92 (1974) 269-275.

⁽²²⁾ The concrete nature of this question is completely lost in Bultmann's existentialist interpretation (*John*, 404).

⁽²³⁾ I am giving the perfect tense its full value. On this, see BDF,

Martha then proceeds to explain in what her faith consists. She makes no mention of the terms used by Jesus himself in vv. 25-26, but states her faith in terms which were acceptable expressions of first century Jewish messianic expectation: the Christ (ὁ Χριστός), the son of God (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ), the one who is coming into the world (ὁ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐρχόμενος) (v. 27b). All of these messianic expressions have been used earlier in the Gospel in a way which fell short of true Johannine faith. The first disciples (see 1,41 [see also 4,25-29 (the Samaritan woman); 7,26.27.31.41.42; 10,24 (the crowds and "the Jews")]) and Nathanael (see 1,49) called Jesus "the Christ" and "the son of God", but they were corrected by the words of Jesus which promised the sight of greater things (1,50-51)⁽²⁴⁾. After the miracle of the loaves and fishes, the crowds confessed that Jesus was the one who was coming into the world (see 6,14), but they also were corrected by Jesus' stern warning that they should not work for a food which perishes (see 6,25-27)⁽²⁵⁾. The reader has no hesitation in classing Martha as having arrived at a stage of partial faith, matching that of Nicodemus (see 3,1-11) and the Samaritan woman (see 4,25-26), who also used acceptable Jewish messianic expressions to express their faith in Jesus⁽²⁶⁾.

175-176, para. 340. See also STIMPFLÉ, *Blinde sehen*, 119. This is generally explained away by commentators by claiming that this is a characteristic use of πιστεύειν in the Fourth Gospel. See, for example, BARRETT, *St John*, 396, citing 3,18; 6,69; 8,31; 11,27; 16,27 and 20,29 as examples. Commentators commend her "firm faith" (SCHNACKENBURG, *St John*, 332). A careful situating of each of these passages in its narrative context, alongside the other 92 uses of πιστεύειν in John renders the word "characteristic" somewhat doubtful. The reader finds the ἐγὼ πεπίστευκα of 11,27 a genuine perfect tense, indicating a coming to faith which preceded Jesus' question in vv. 25-27. Her words in v. 27 show that she has not moved beyond that point. An identical use of the perfect tense of πιστεύειν to indicate partial faith is found in the troublesome 8,31. On this, see G. SEGALLA, "Un appello alla perseveranza nella fede in Gv 8,31-32?", *Bib* 62 (1981) 387-389.

⁽²⁴⁾ See MOLONEY, *Belief in the Word*, 67-75.

⁽²⁵⁾ BARRETT, *St John*, 397, claims too much for "the one who is to come into the world" when he comments that the Evangelist "uses it to express his own fundamental conception of the mission of Jesus from the Father". BROWN, *John*, I,425, sees the problem of the parallel between 6,14 and 11,27, but suggests that Martha expresses a different expectation. The Johannine reader takes consistency for granted.

⁽²⁶⁾ On these "stages of faith", see the summary in MOLONEY, *Belief in the Word*, 192-199.

Martha's failure fully to understand who Jesus is does not lessen the impact, and the christological significance for the reader, of Jesus' self-revelation in 11,25-26. Indeed, the failure of Martha to grasp what Jesus is saying of himself makes it even more urgent for the reader to accept these words. The reader is aware that no character in the story as it is reported in 11,1-27, has shown true faith in Jesus: neither the disciples (see v.16), nor Martha (v.27)⁽²⁷⁾. But Jesus will not renounce his mission to make God known to them (see 1,18). The reader knows, on the authority of the word of Jesus, that the glory of God will result from the miracle and that the Son of God will be glorified by means of it (see v.4). Jesus has instructed his disciples that the miracle at Bethany will take place "so that you may believe" (v.15), but Thomas' response gave no indication that they had understood what Jesus was asking from them (v.16). Jesus' attempt at self-revelation to Martha has failed (vv. 25-27), but the story must continue so that the promise of v.4 will be fulfilled: "This illness is not unto death; it is for the glory of God, so that the Son of God may be glorified by means of it".

(27) My reading of vv. 21-27 as an encounter between Jesus and Martha which does not lead Martha to true belief does not represent accepted scholarly opinion. SCHNACKENBURG, *St John*, II,328, and B. LINDARS, *The Gospel of John* (NCC; London 1972) 396, regard Martha's words as the theological climax of the chapter. For R.E. BROWN, "Roles of Women in the Fourth Gospel", *TS* 36 (1975) 693-694, Martha replaces Peter as the one who makes the supreme confession of faith. M. SCOTT, *Sophia and the Johannine Jesus* (JSNTSS 71; Sheffield 1992) 199-206, argues that Martha's confession is "both fully Johannine and... consistent with the pattern of the revelation of Jesus as Sophia". KREMER, *Lazarus*, presents a consensus of opinion when he writes: "Auf dem Höhepunkt und am Schluss des Gesprächs zwischen Marta und Jesus kommt diesem kurzen Credo ein besonderes Gewicht zu". The list could go on: Barrett, Beasley-Murray, Becker, Carson, Gnilka, Haenchen, Lagrange, Marchadour, Marsh, Rochais, Schneiders, Segalla, Sloyan, Stibbe, etc. Scholars discuss the origins of Martha's words as a primitive creed (see BARRETT, *St John*, 397) and even suggest that it was a baptismal confession (see G. BORNKAMM, "Das Bekenntnis im Hebräerbrief", *Studien zu Antike und Urchristentum. Gesammelte Aufsätze Band II* [BEvT 28; München 1959] 191-192, n.8). But what came first: the Johannine context or the credal use of Martha's words in the Christian Church? Vv. 21-27 must be interpreted within the context of the Johannine narrative. See also STIMPFLE, *Blinde sehen*, 117-119; BYRNE, *Lazarus*, 53-54. Stimpfle's conclusions are close to mine.

II. Jesus and Mary

The scene shifts, as the narrator links Martha's return to her sister with her partial confession of faith in v. 27 (v. 28a: καὶ τοῦτο εἰποῦσα), summoning Mary by quietly telling her: Ὁ διδάσκαλος πάρεστιν (v. 28b). The reader, aware that she has not come to a full understanding of Jesus in v. 27, now finds her giving him the title "the Teacher" which again reflects her limited faith in the word and person of Jesus. This term has been used to speak of Jesus on two earlier occasions in the narrative. Both occasions reflect an imperfect understanding of Jesus (1,38: the first disciples; 3,2: Nicodemus)⁽²⁸⁾. Martha passes from one series of limited expressions of faith (11,21-22.24.27) to another (v. 28). The only impact that the encounter with Jesus seems to have made upon Martha is reflected in her reporting Jesus' presence "quietly" (λάθρᾳ)⁽²⁹⁾. Her aggression has abated somewhat. Martha informs her sister that the Teacher is calling her (v. 28b: καὶ φωνεῖ σε). Although the same verb is used of Martha's summoning Mary (v. 28a: ἐφώνησεν), the reader recalls the many earlier occasions when the φωνή of Jesus was given particular significance in summoning people to true faith. Without exception, every reference to the φωνή of Jesus in the story to this point is a call to the fulness of life with him (see 3,8.29; 5,25.28; 10,3.4.16.27). For this reason, Jesus condemns "the Jews" who never hear the voice of the Sent One (see 5,37). There is a heavy concentration on the voice of the shepherd in 10,1-18 (see vv. 3, 4, 16, 17). In Jesus' description of the shepherd, a passage which the reader has just left behind, the only place where Jesus uses the verb φωνέω to speak of his own activity has appeared: "The sheep hear his voice (τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ), and he calls (φωνεῖ) his own sheep by name and leads them out" (10,3). This is the background for the summoning of Mary. She is one of

⁽²⁸⁾ On these uses of διδάσκαλος as imperfect confessions of faith, see MOLONEY, *Belief in the Word*, 67-68, 108-109. It is, of course, the Greek for "Rabbi", which has always been used to address Jesus in contexts of limited faith (see 1,38.49; 3,2; 4,31; 6,25; 9,2; 11,8). BARRETT, *St John*, 397, admits: "The description is surprising after the exalted terms of Martha's faith (v. 27)".

⁽²⁹⁾ BROWN, *John*, I,425, suggests that this is a "cautious whispering" to keep Jesus' presence secret from "the Jews". KREMER, *Lazarus*, 71, links it with the Johannine Church's exclusion from the Synagogue. The detail also indicates the weakening of Mary's role in the narrative.

the Lord's own sheep, and he is summoning her⁽³⁰⁾. In stark contrast with her sister, who took the initiative in going out to Jesus, and who refused to allow Jesus to take the initiative from her (see 11,21-22.24.27), Mary is called forth by the word of Jesus⁽³¹⁾.

The reader is already aware, from the information provided in v. 2, that Mary will be the special sister⁽³²⁾. Her response to the word of Jesus reinforces such an impression. Every carefully etched detail of v. 29 continues to enhance the author's portrait of Mary. This woman (v. 29a: ἐκείνη), when she hears of his call (v. 29b: ὡς ἤκουσεν) responds immediately (v. 29c: ἠγέρθη ταχὺ καὶ ἤρχετο πρὸς αὐτόν)⁽³³⁾. The reader has become accustomed to the use of the verb ἀκούειν in descriptions of a positive response to the word of Jesus (see 1,37.40; 3,8,29.32; 4,42.47; 5,24.25.28.30; 6,45; 7,40.51; 8,47). This verb has been used four times, in the immediate context, of the sheep responding to the voice of the Good Shepherd (10,3.16.20.27)⁽³⁴⁾. However widespread scholarly opinion may be that Mary is the lesser sister, the story itself is pointing in the opposite direction.

The narrator paints in some geographical detail, so that the motion of the characters in the narrative can make sense⁽³⁵⁾. Jesus has not yet arrived in the village, but is still at the place where

⁽³⁰⁾ See KREMER, *Lazarus*, 71.

⁽³¹⁾ The following positive interpretation is again at variance with commentary on the passage. I disagree with the remarks of BROWN, *John*, I,435: "This scene does not advance the action; vs. 34 could easily follow vs. 27, and no one would know the difference". ROCHAIS, *Les récits de résurrection*, 143, regards vv. 28-31 as "versets de remplissage", and SCOTT, *Sophia*, 206 comments that "Mary's role... is almost insignificant in comparison with that of her sister". STIMPfle, *Blinde sehen*, 139-140, associates Mary with the mourning of "the Jews" throughout vv. 31-35. There have been attempts to show Mary as the model receptive disciple (see, for example, S.M. SCHNEIDERS, "Women in the Fourth Gospel and the Role of Women in the Contemporary Church", *BTB* 12 [1982] 41-42), but most look to 12,1-8 for this interpretation.

⁽³²⁾ Historical-critical analysis, which disregards v. 2, produces SCHNACKENBURG, *St John*, II,333: "Mary thus gives the impression of being nothing but a complaining woman". On v. 2 as a gloss, see *ibid.*, II,322.

⁽³³⁾ See BARRETT, *St John*, 397, on the importance of "coming to Jesus".

⁽³⁴⁾ The same verb has been used *against* those who do not listen to the voice of Jesus (see 5,37; 6,60; 8,38.43.47).

⁽³⁵⁾ On the skill of this "layout", see HAENCHEN, *John* 2, 65.

Martha met him (11,30). This necessitates movement from Mary (v. 29), and enables the author to introduce “the Jews” who were with her in the house, comforting her (v. 31a). Nothing has been said about the emotional state of Mary. It is only “the Jews” who offer consolation (see vv. 19, 31). The focalisation of the narrative changes briefly, as Mary’s actions (see v. 29) are reported through the eyes of “the Jews”⁽³⁶⁾. Their interpretation of Mary’s immediate rising and exit is that she is going to the tomb to weep there, so they follow her (v. 31b). The reader knows better. She is responding to the call of Jesus, which — as the reader also knows — transcends all human concerns. As so often in the Johannine narrative, there is a clash of worlds: that which flows from the presence of Jesus (see v. 28: ὁ διδάσκαλος πάρεστιν)⁽³⁷⁾, and that which flows from accepted religious, cultural and historical custom (see v. 31c: δόξαντες ὅτι ὑπάγει εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον ἵνα κλαύσῃ ἐκεῖ)⁽³⁸⁾.

The focus returns to Mary, who comes to the place where Jesus was. On arrival, a further contrast between herself and Martha appears. In v. 21 the narrator simply reported: “Martha said to Jesus...”. The reader notices that Mary’s encounter with Jesus begins with two different verbs. The narrator reports that when she saw Jesus (v. 32b: ἰδοῦσα αὐτόν) she fell at his feet (v. 32c: ἔπεσεν αὐτοῦ πρὸς τοὺς πόδας). Her attitude to the presence of Jesus is markedly different from that of her sister. It is highlighted by receptivity and respect for the person of Jesus⁽³⁹⁾. The reader recalls

⁽³⁶⁾ On “focalisation” in a narrative, see G. GENETTE, *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method* (Ithaca, NY 1980) 189-194; S. RIMMON-KENAN, *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics* (New Accents; London 1983) 71-85.

⁽³⁷⁾ BARRETT, *St John*, 397, notes the relationship between this verb and the noun παρουσία. See also KREMER, *Lazarus*, 71.

⁽³⁸⁾ Some manuscripts (e.g. P66, Alexandrinus, Koridethi) read λέγοντες, rather than δόξαντες. The sense of an inner expression of *common opinion* must be maintained, on both textual and narrative grounds. As SCHNACKENBURG, *St John*, II,334, correctly notes: “She is *expected* to give way to her grief and ‘weep’ at the tomb”. Stress mine.

⁽³⁹⁾ It is not, as BYRNE, *Lazarus*, 56, comments, “extremity of emotion”. Nor, as J. CALLOUD – F. GENUYT, *L’Évangile de Jean (II). Lecture sémiotique des chapitres 7 à 12* (Lyons 1987) 104-106, argue, does Mary “somatise” the failure of Martha’s “verbalisation”.

that the only character who has fallen at the feet of Jesus at this stage of the story is the man born blind (see 9,35-38). On hearing that the Son of Man was the one whom he could see, and who was speaking to him (v. 37), he confessed his faith (v. 38a: Πιστεύω κύριε) and fell to the ground before Jesus (v. 38b: προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ)⁽⁴⁰⁾. The reader of John 11 is not told that Mary rises. By means of participial constructions (11,32a: ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν ἔπεσεν... λέγουσα αὐτῷ), the narrator stresses that from her position at the feet of Jesus she repeats *part* of the words of Martha (v. 32b; see v. 22).

The words of Mary addressed to Jesus omit the motivation which Martha gave for her confidence in Jesus' ability to heal Lazarus from his fatal illness: "whatever you ask from God, God will give you" (v. 22)⁽⁴¹⁾. Martha's request paralleled other expressions of faith in the Gospel which attempted to make of Jesus a messianic miracle worker (see 1,49-51; 2,23-25; 3,1-11; 4,25-26; 6,25-27), but no such misunderstanding lies behind Mary's trust in Jesus' presence. The context gives the words of Mary a different meaning. She has responded to the call of the Good Shepherd (see vv. 28-29) and, in the midst of misunderstanding from "the Jews" (v. 31), she has placed herself in a position of total trust in him (v. 32a). Her words indicate her belief that the presence of Jesus would have saved Lazarus (v. 32b). Nothing more is called for. Jesus is accepted, unconditionally, as the resurrection and the life (see vv. 25-26). There is no need for him to ask for a miracle from God (see v. 22). Only Mary accepts the full significance of Jesus' revelation of himself as Ἐγώ εἰμι (see v. 26). It is Mary who makes a confession of faith with these words, not Martha. The repetition of the words of Martha by Mary does not show that she is in some way a weaker "shadow" of her more powerful sister⁽⁴²⁾. The reader is now aware that Mary is the character in the story reflecting genuine Johannine faith (see vv. 29, 32), while Martha has fallen short of such faith (see vv. 21-22, 24, 27).

⁽⁴⁰⁾ The verbs are not the same, but the action is. The reader also recalls the use of the verb προσκυνέω in the discussion of true worship in 4,20-24. On this, see MOLONEY, *Belief in the Word*, 149-153, esp. 152, n. 82.

⁽⁴¹⁾ BYRNE, *Lazarus*, 56, misses the point when he describes Mary's words as "a poor, truncated piece compared with Martha's".

⁽⁴²⁾ This expression is used by W. BAUER, *Das Johannesevangelium erklärt* (HKNT 6; Tübingen ³1933) 157, citing Wellhausen. It is also used by HAENCHEN, *John* 2, 65.

Jesus is strangely moved as Mary *adds her tears to the wailing of the Jews who have come out with her* (v. 33). Up to this point of the story Mary's attention has been totally focussed upon her response to Jesus. The death of Lazarus should never be at centre-stage... but even Mary succumbs, joining "the Jews" in their wailing. Jesus has informed the disciples that the problem of Lazarus' death will be solved (see v. 11). The reader knows that Jesus is about to perform an action which will show forth the glory of God, through which the Son of God will be glorified (see vv. 4, 11). The miracle is an attempt, on the part of Jesus, to bring his disciples (see v. 15) and Martha (see vv. 25-26) to true faith. Even more importantly, it is a parable of Jesus' self-revelation as the resurrection and the life. It is not compassion — or lack of it — which creates Jesus' emotion⁽⁴³⁾. At the sight of Mary's joining "the Jews" in their lamentations, Jesus is moved to anger in spirit and troubled (v. 33: Ἰησοῦς οὖν ὡς εἶδεν αὐτὴν κλαίουσαν καὶ τοὺς συνελθόντας αὐτῇ Ἰουδαίους κλαίοντας, ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτὸν). The verb ἐμβριμάσθαι is associated with anger, and in its Johannine form its force is accentuated with the addition of a prefix⁽⁴⁴⁾. A debate hinges around the seemingly impossible portrait of Jesus' anger when faced with the loss of Lazarus, which has produced the tears of Mary and "the Jews"⁽⁴⁵⁾. The emerging reader, however, aware that the end of Jesus' public ministry is close at hand, joins Jesus' frustrated anger (ἐνεβριμήσατο) and deep, shuddering,

⁽⁴³⁾ On the dangers of psychologising interpretations, see SCHNACKENBURG, *St John*, II, 334-335; E. C. HOSKYNs-F. N. DAVEY (ed.), *The Fourth Gospel* (London 1947) 404.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ The basic meaning of the verb is to express anger outwardly, for example, with a snort or the like. But this is internalised here by the addition of τῷ πνεύματι. On the verb, see LSJ 330, s. v. βριμάζω; 540, s. v. ἐμβριμάομαι. See the survey of its use in classical literature in B. LINDARS, "Rebuking the Spirit. A New Analysis of the Lazarus Story of John 11", *NTS* 38 (1992) 92-96.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ It is not possible to offer a history of this discussion. For surveys, see BARRETT, *St John*, 398-400; BROWN, *John*, I, 425-426. For earlier discussions, see M.-J. LAGRANGE, *Évangile selon Saint Jean* (EB; Paris 1936) 303-305. Attempts have been made to lessen the idea of anger, to the extent that P45, P66 and Codex Bezae add "as if" before the verb. M. BLACK, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford 1967) 240, suggests that the two Greek verbs translate one Aramaic expression meaning "to be moved strongly". For a discussion of the textual variants, and this possible Aramaic background, see BARRETT, *St John*, 399-400.

internal emotion (ἐτάραξεν)⁽⁴⁶⁾. Mary, who earlier has shown every sign of moving in the world of Jesus rather than that of “the Jews” (see v. 31), is now reported as having joined “the Jews” in their tears (v. 33a).

The story, as it has been reported thus far, has been marked by the awareness of Jesus that he was journeying towards Jerusalem to show forth the glory of God, and for his own glorification (v. 4). The events of Bethany must not be regarded as an end in themselves. One of the sisters in the story which is about to be told is indicated as a person who anointed Jesus (v. 2). Jesus has told his misunderstanding disciples that he is glad to be going to Bethany. His presence there, to wake Lazarus from sleep (see v. 11), is a further attempt to bring them to true belief (v. 15). But Thomas’ heroic response to Jesus’ summons to true faith is complete misunderstanding (v. 16). On arrival at the outskirts of Bethany he is met by Martha, who lectures him on her belief in him as the expected messianic miracle worker (vv. 21-22), and traditional belief in the resurrection (v. 24). He has attempted to lead her beyond these conditional responses (vv. 25-26), and asked for belief from her (v. 26b). But she has not been prepared to move from her present misunderstanding of Jesus (v. 27). Only one character in the story has moved towards Jesus, heard his voice, shown her receptivity and commitment to who he is, and trusted in the power of his presence: Mary, the one who will anoint Jesus (see vv. 2, 29, 32). However, she is now reported as weeping with “the Jews”. Till now, nothing has been said of the tears or mourning of Mary⁽⁴⁷⁾. She has not been reported as crying at any earlier stage of the narrative. It has been “the Jews” who were in the house, mourning (see vv. 19, 31). Now, after a demonstration of an attitude of authentic faith (vv. 28-32), she is described as in tears (v. 33). But more dramatically for the reader: she is in tears, along with “the Jews” who came out to Jesus with her (v. 33a). This is the crucial issue. Will no one come to true

⁽⁴⁶⁾ Commentators rightly point out that the expressions τῷ πνεύματι of v. 33, and ἐν ἑαυτῷ of v. 38 are parallel. There is no reference to anger “in the Spirit”, but a deep, internal experience.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Mary’s remaining seated in the house (see v. 20) does not indicate her taking up a traditional position of mourning, despite Job 2,8.13; Ezek 8,14. It is inaccurate to claim “Marie de bout en bout est marquée par une série cumulative de notions funèbres” (MARCHADOUR, *Lazare*, 124).

belief? Mary, who earlier responded to the voice of Jesus, rather than the expectations of “the Jews” that she would go to weep at the tomb (v. 31), is now with “the Jews”, overcome by tears at the loss of her brother (v. 33a). Has she, along with “the Jews”, made the death of Lazarus the centre of her attention, and thus lost Jesus? This is a reversal of her response to Jesus earlier in the narrative (vv. 28-32).

Jesus comes to the end of his ministry, angry (or perhaps “severely disappointed” is a better English rendition)⁽⁴⁸⁾ that even Mary, the one who shows the best signs of belief in who he is, the Good Shepherd (see vv. 28-29), and what he comes to bring, resurrection and life (see vv. 25-26, 32), is at risk⁽⁴⁹⁾. The human event of the death of Lazarus, and the expected emotional response of tears and mourning shown by “the Jews” (see vv. 19, 31) threaten the incipient, but authentic, faith of Mary. Thus Jesus is deeply moved by a justifiable anger and emotion⁽⁵⁰⁾. It is the story itself which explains the emotion of Jesus. There is only one solution to this problem. Jesus must proceed with the mission which has been

(48) WESTCOTT, *St John*, 170, points out that “indignation” is part of the general notion implied by the verb.

(49) There is no need to resort to a softening of the context, suggesting that Jesus is moved by his sympathy for the sufferers. See, for example, LINDARS, *John*, 398-399; SCHNEIDERS, “Death in the Community”, 54; M. W. G. STIBBE, *John* (Readings: A New Biblical Commentary; Sheffield 1993) 124-125. BARRETT, *St John*, 398, rightly dismisses any suggestions that Jesus is angry with the hypocrisy of “the Jews”. It is Mary’s association with the wailing of “the Jews” which angers Jesus. SCHNACKENBURG, *St John*, II, 336, sees “lack of faith of the wailers” as the reason for Jesus’ anger, but does not see the importance of Mary’s association with it. BULTMANN, *John*, 406, and HOSKYNs, *Fourth Gospel*, 404-405, do link Mary with “the Jews”. Recently, LINDARS, “Rebuking the Spirit”, 97-104, has claimed that John’s source (parallel to Synoptic exorcisms: see Mark 1,43; 9,25-29) originally had Jesus rebuking the spirit. In John, not demons, but death is overcome. In accommodating the source to its present context, John’s use of ἐμβρίμασθαι is conditioned by παράσσω, and thus — shifted from its original angry context — comes to mean emotionally moved.

(50) A number of scholars see the use of παράσσω as a link with the forthcoming passion. See, for example, J. BEUTLER, “Psalm 42/43 im Johannevangelium”, *NTS* 25 (1978-79) 38-46; A. T. HANSON, *The Prophetic Gospel. A Study of John and the Old Testament* (Edinburgh 1991) 156-158. Later appearances of the same verb (see 12,27; 13,31) will make the link clearer to the reader.

entrusted to him⁽⁵¹⁾. He must wake Lazarus from his sleep (see v.11), glorify God, and through this event experience his own glorification (v.4). Thus he asks to be led to the tomb of Lazarus, and “they” invite him to “come and see”. It is Mary and “the Jews” (v.33) who comprise the “they” (v.34)⁽⁵²⁾. They respectfully (Κύριε) invite Jesus to proceed to the tomb, to see the situation of a person who has been enclosed there for four days (see v.17)⁽⁵³⁾. Once again, it is this association of the one who had best responded to the call of the Good Shepherd with “the Jews” which leads to Jesus’ tears (v.35).

The emotion of v.33b continues in the tears described in v.35, as the remarks of “the Jews” in v.36 continue to reflect misunderstanding⁽⁵⁴⁾. Jesus is not weeping because of the death of Lazarus, the disappointment of Martha, or the tears of Mary. The deliberate use of another verb to speak of the weeping of Jesus (δακρῶ [to weep], rather than the κλαίω [to wail] used of Mary and “the Jews” in vv. 31 and 33) informs the reader that his weeping cannot be associated with the mourning which has created his emotional response⁽⁵⁵⁾. Whatever may have been the depths of Jesus’ love for Lazarus (v.36; see v.3), this is not the point of his tears. He is weeping because of the danger that his unconditional gift of himself in love as the Good Shepherd (see 10,11.14-15). the resurrection and the life who offers life here and hereafter to all who would believe in him (11,25-26) will never be understood or

(51) Jesus is, despite his emotion, the master of the situation. On this characteristic of the Johannine Jesus, see R. A. CULPEPPER, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel. A Study in Literary Design* (Foundation and Facets; Philadelphia 1983) 111.

(52) Against WESTCOTT, *St John*, 171, and BERNARD, *St John*, II,394, who guess that “they” must refer to Martha and Mary.

(53) The expression used in v.34: “come and see” recalls Jesus’ provocative use of these words in 1,39. LIGHTFOOT, *St John*, 233, draws a contrast between the invitation of Jesus and the invitation of human beings. The repetition is probably coincidental.

(54) See BAUER, *Johannesevangelium*, 153; HOSKYNs, *Fourth Gospel*, 405; BEASLEY-MURRAY, *John*, 194. Many commentators wrongly remark that at least here “the Jews” interpret the actions of Jesus correctly. See, for example, BERNARD, *St John*, II,394; BARRETT, *St John*, 400.

(55) This is the only place in the NT where the verb δακρῶ appears. The noun δάκρυον appears in Heb 5,7 (significantly in the famous passage on Jesus’ loud cries and tears).

accepted. While Mary moved generously towards Jesus, responding to his voice (vv. 28-29) and trusting in him as the resurrection and the life (see v. 32) there was hope. But once she joined "the Jews" in their sorrowing and tears, Jesus' promises seem to have been forgotten. In the clash of worlds, the world of Jesus — totally determined by his response to his Father — seems to have lost, and Jesus weeps in his frustration and disappointment (v. 35)⁽⁵⁶⁾. This, however, has not altered his response to his task to make visible the glory of God and go through his own glorification: "Where have you laid him?" (v. 34a)⁽⁵⁷⁾. The reader, aware that Jesus will wake Lazarus from his sleep (see v. 11), waits for the miracle.

"The Jews" continue to judge Jesus according to their own criteria. Their misunderstanding comes to its climax in v. 37. Looking back to the miracle of the man born blind (9,1-7), some of "the Jews" join Martha's understanding of Jesus as a miracle worker (see 11,21-22). *Here, however, Mary is not associated with them.* It is only "the Jews" who recall that Jesus had shown that he was able to work significant miracles. Why is it that he could not prevent the death of Lazarus? Jesus has every reason for profound emotion as "the Jews" continue to ignore who he is, and the promises which he is making as his public ministry draws to a close. They, like Martha, are unprepared to move away from their own criteria for judging the person and mission of Jesus. The reader is aware that in this attempt to assess Jesus as a miracle worker "the Jews" — as always — are quite wrong⁽⁵⁸⁾. They have not moved from the messianic expectations expressed during the feast of Tabernacles, when some of the people asked: "When the Christ appears, will he do more signs than this man has done?" (7,31). However, even that incorrect assessment of Jesus is now in crisis: he has not been able to cure the illness of this man.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ BULTMANN, *John*, 407, rightly sees the surrounding unfaith as the reason for Jesus' emotion in both v. 33 and v. 35.

⁽⁵⁷⁾ This question has nothing to do with a contradiction of Jesus' omniscience, as HAENCHEN, *John* 2, 66, claims. It is a sign of his commitment to the project of v. 4, promised to both the disciples and the reader in v. 11.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ This misunderstanding is missed by commentators who identify "the Jews" here with the general population. See, for example, LÉON-DUFOUR, *Lecture*, II,424-425; KREMER, *Lazarus*, 74.

But what of Mary? For the moment, she disappears from the action, swallowed up in the human emotions surrounding the death of her brother. Will the early promise of her authentic belief in Jesus, the Good Shepherd who was calling her (see vv. 28-29) and her trust in his authority as the resurrection and the life (see v. 32), come to nothing? There is a sign that she has not fallen completely into the world imposed by "the Jews", as she is no longer with them in their understanding of Jesus as a failing miracle worker in v. 37. But there is more. The reader, who has known from the beginning of the story of the events at Bethany that she is the one who anointed Jesus and wiped his feet with her hair (see v. 2), is aware that this cannot be the end of her story.

III. Verses 38-40: Martha at the Tomb

Another stage in the story opens as Jesus, once again moved to anger by the ongoing inability of "the Jews" to understanding him (v. 38a; see vv. 36-37)⁽⁵⁹⁾, "comes to the tomb" (v. 38b: ἔρχεται εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον)⁽⁶⁰⁾. As well as a change in location, the reader notices a change in Jesus' attitude. In the earlier episodes he has delayed (v. 6), he has asked for belief (vv. 16, 27), and he has shown anger and emotion (vv. 33, 35, 38a). He has asked to be shown the place where Lazarus was buried. Mary and "the Jews" offered to take him to the place that he might see it (v. 34). Now the reader finds that Jesus is not shown to the tomb; he goes there. He is the master of the situation⁽⁶¹⁾. Jesus moves decisively to fulfil God's design (see v. 4) which, the reader knows, involves waking Lazarus from sleep (see v. 11). A series of initiatives from Jesus will dominate the brief account of Jesus' presence at the tomb (vv. 38-44). The imperative mood will be used no less than four times (vv. 39, 43, 44

⁽⁵⁹⁾ Thus BULTMANN, *John*, 407.

⁽⁶⁰⁾ It is here that I differ from the structure of MARCHADOUR, *Lazare*, 86-87. Marchadour is led by the presence of mourning and the tomb in both v. 31 and 39, thus forming an inclusion which creates a section of vv. 31-39. An inclusion is a confirmation of a division, but a repetition may also indicate the beginning of a new section, and not necessarily its conclusion. In this case the change of place in v. 38 marks the beginning of a new section.

⁽⁶¹⁾ See HOSKYNS, *Fourth Gospel*, 405.

[twice])(⁶²). It is only in his communication with the Father (vv. 41-42) that Jesus shows an attitude of dependence.

The tomb is described: "it was a cave, and a stone lay upon it" (v. 38b)(⁶³). Jesus issues his first order: "Take away the stone" (v. 39a)(⁶⁴). Martha, whom the reader has followed from one partial understanding of Jesus to another (see vv. 21-22, 24, 27) objects to Jesus' command (v. 39b). Still moving in her own world, she tells Jesus how things are in that world: as it is four days since Lazarus died, there will be a dreadful odour. Can this be the response of someone who has accepted that Jesus is the resurrection and the life, and that whoever lives and believes in him will never die (see vv. 25-26)? Martha has never expressed any such faith. She has always believed that Jesus is *her* expected Messiah (see v. 27). She informs "the resurrection and the life" (see v. 25) that a body shut up in a tomb for days will be badly decomposed and will smell(⁶⁵). Martha's first words in the Fourth Gospel proclaimed her faith in Jesus as a miracle worker (vv. 21-22); her parting words inform Jesus that he has no authority over the decomposing body of someone who has been dead for four days (v. 39)(⁶⁶).

Jesus no longer attempts to lead her beyond the prison of her own world with further self-revelation. He looks back to his earlier words, but in a way which the reader will understand, although, the reader suspects, Martha may not. Rather than re-stating his claim to

(⁶²) BARRETT, *St John*, 401, writes of the "highly dramatic speed" of this part of the story.

(⁶³) The general term *μνημεῖον* is further described as a cave (*σπήλαιον*). This type of burial place was widespread in first-century Palestine. See J. JEREMIAS, *Heiligengräber in Jesu Umwelt. Eine Untersuchung zur Volksreligion der Zeit Jesu* (Göttingen 1958).

(⁶⁴) KREMER, *Lazarus*, 75, points out that Mary Magdalene will find the stone of Jesus' tomb already removed. See also BYRNE, *Lazarus*, 63.

(⁶⁵) See also BYRNE, *Lazarus*, 62. A. LOISY, *Le quatrième évangile* (Paris 1921) 352-353, and BULTMANN, *John*, 407, n.7, point to the contradiction, but most scholars struggle to combine the supreme confession of Johannine faith of v. 27 with this answer to Jesus' command in v. 39. See, for example, LINDARS, *John*, 399-400; KREMER, *Lazarus*, 75; LÉON-DUFOUR, *Lecture*, II, 426-427. Some simply ignore it (e.g. BARRETT, *St John*, 402), others (e.g. BULTMANN, *John*, 407) put it down to a confusion of sources. SCHNACKENBURG, *St John*, II, 338, claims that "it is a mistake to worry about the contradiction" (!).

(⁶⁶) See STIMPFLE, *Blinde sehen*, 138.

be the resurrection and the life, and his promise of life on both sides of physical death (see vv. 25-26), Jesus speaks of the sight of the glory of God. "For the evangelist physical raising of the dead is only a sign for Jesus' power to give *believers* the true life which survives death" (67). Martha is reminded of the importance of belief in the word of Jesus (v. 40: Οὐκ εἰπόν σοι ὅτι ἐὰν πιστεύσῃς...). Jesus has told her that *if only she would believe* she would see τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ. The guiding, caring, saving presence of God would be visible to her through the events which she is about to witness... if only she would believe (68). The verb is in the singular; it is the faith of Martha which is in question.

The reader, aware that Martha has not been able to transcend the limitations of her own world (see vv. 21-22, 24, 27, 39), understands Jesus' indication to Martha that she is not believing, and thus is not able to identify in Jesus the δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ (see 1,14; 2,11). But the reader suspects more. Jesus' words to the disciples promised that the illness of Lazarus was not unto death, but for the δόξα of God and for the glorification of the Son of God (see v. 4). The reader suspects that Martha will not be able to grasp the full significance of Jesus' actions when he wakes Lazarus from his sleep (see v. 11). What is needed is true belief, and Martha's words in v. 39 have shown Jesus that she still has some way to go in her journey of faith (v. 40a). As the experience of the disciples at Cana has shown, the eyes of faith see already, in the wonderful actions of Jesus, the revelation of the δόξα (see 2,11). Nothing more is reported of Martha's response to Jesus, to the miracle, nor to Jesus' prayer to his Father διὰ τὸν ὄχλον τὸν περιεστώτα (see vv. 41b-42). The reader knows that the miracle of the raising of Lazarus (see vv. 43-44) is to make visible the action of God (see vv. 4, 40). The physical transformation of the dead body of Lazarus into the risen Lazarus is not the main point of the story. Jesus' action has revealed the δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ (see vv. 4, 40), so that the disciples might believe (see vv. 15, 42); so that Martha and Mary might believe (see vv. 26,

(67) SCHNACKENBURG, *St John* II,338. Stress mine.

(68) For this meaning of δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ, see MOLONEY, *Belief in the Word*, 55-57. All the bystanders will see the events, but only the believer will see the δόξα. See LIGHTFOOT, *St John*, 224. Most commentators read v. 40 as a promise rather than a recommendation to greater faith. See, for example, KREMER, *Lazarus*, 76.

40, 42); so that Mary and "the Jews" might believe (see vv. 33, 42). The greater transformation would be the acceptance of all who witnessed the miracle that Jesus was the Son of the Father, the Sent One of God (see v. 42)⁽⁶⁹⁾. A remarkable sign has shown the δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ (v. 4c), but the reader reads on to trace how the miracle of the raising of Lazarus will be the means by which the Son of God will be glorified (v. 4d: ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ δι' αὐτῆς).

IV. Conclusion: Martha and Mary

The story of Martha has had a beginning (vv. 20-22), a middle (vv. 24, 27) and an end (v. 39). She fades from the story, appearing once more, serving a meal in Bethany (see 12,2). But what of Mary? There are important hints to the reader that her story is far from finished. Although she joined the tears of "the Jews" in v. 33, she also witnessed the revelation of the δόξα in the resurrection of Lazarus. Does this influence her story in any way? One of the results of the miracle is a *schisma* among "the Jews" (see vv. 45-46). The many who are described as coming to belief in Jesus are further described as those who had earlier gone to Mary (v. 45). The reader takes it for granted that this refers to the coming of "the Jews" from nearby Jerusalem to console the sisters, reported in v. 19. But in v. 19 both sisters were mentioned. Now, as many come to belief in Jesus, they are referred to as "those who had gone to Mary" (v. 45: Πολλοὶ οὖν ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, οἱ ἐλθόντες πρὸς τὴν Μαριάμ)⁽⁷⁰⁾. There is a singling out of Mary and an association with those who believe. Where might this lead?

Mary made a promising response to Jesus' call (see vv. 28-32), only to be swept up into the emotion created by Lazarus' death, joining "the Jews" in their tears (see v. 33). This failure in faith merited the anger and emotion of Jesus (see vv. 33, 35, 38), but it did not prevent him from raising Lazarus, so that the people standing around the tomb might come to faith in him as the sent one of the Father (see v. 42). While there was a beginning (see vv. 21-22) and an end (see v. 39) to the story of Martha's limited response to Jesus,

⁽⁶⁹⁾ See KREMER, *Lazarus*, 80.

⁽⁷⁰⁾ Reading οἱ ἐλθόντες πρὸς Μαριάμ as a recollection of v. 19, and not "who had come with Mary" (RSV). For my reading, see BERNARD, *St John* II, 401-402; LÉON-DUFOUR, *Lecture*, II, 430.

the reader looks for a resolution to Mary's faltering. Has the miracle of Lazarus done anything for her belief in Jesus? What of the anointing, mentioned by the narrator in v. 2? The reader has been further prodded into asking questions about Mary through the information that "the Jews" who came to faith were the ones who had earlier gone to Mary (v. 45). Justifiably, the reader looks forward to a fuller report of the events mentioned in v. 2, in the hope that this woman, who began so well in her response to Jesus, might also have a fitting conclusion to her story. The reader will not be disappointed, as Mary's anointing makes her the first character in the narrative to recognise the uniqueness of Jesus' death (see 12,1-8, esp. v. 7) ⁽⁷¹⁾.

Australian Catholic University
P.O. Box 968
North Sydney
N.S.W. 2059 Australia

Francis MOLONEY S.D.B.

SOMMAIRE

À peu près tout le monde estime que, en Jn 11, la confession de foi de Marthe en 11,27 est un sommet du récit. Marie est la plus jeune sœur et elle reste à l'ombre de Marthe. Mais en est-il bien ainsi? La question qu'une approche narrative pose au récit de Jn 11 est la suivante: quelle est la fonction de la référence à l'onction de Jésus par Marie en 11,2? Le lecteur aborde le récit avec cette question en tête. La confession de Marthe, en dépit de sa similitude avec le texte de 20,31, que le lecteur rencontrera plus tard, évoque d'autres personnages du récit antérieur qui, comme Marthe, ont appelé Jésus «fils de Dieu» (Nathanaël; 1,49), «Christ» (la Samaritaine; 4,25) ou «celui qui doit venir» (6,14-15). Jésus a corrigé ces expressions d'une foi encore partielle; ceci signifie que Marthe, qui reprend ces expressions, en est au même stade. Quant à la réponse de Marie à Jésus, elle jure avec l'image des brebis qui répondent à la voix du Bon Pasteur (10,4-5.16). Marie se rachètera plus tard; en effet, la prolepse de 11,2 annonce le récit de 12,1-8.

⁽⁷¹⁾ I hope to argue this case in greater detail in *Signs and Shadows. Reading John 5-12*.

The Logic and Language of Romans 1,20

“For the invisible things of God are perceived through the understanding from the creation of the world in God’s works, both God’s eternal power and divinity, so that they are without excuse” — Rom 1,20. A close investigation of the logic and language of this well-trodden verse yields a clear picture of Paul’s skill in adopting philosophical elements from the culture of his time. From a logical point of view, Paul makes use of a philosophical claim that God can be perceived through God’s works in order to construct a rhetorical enthymeme. He uses the enthymeme to show that humans are without excuse, because they suppress their knowledge of God by idolatry. This rejection of the use of images in worship sets him apart from the dominant culture. From a linguistic point of view, we will show by using the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* that the words Paul uses are Hellenistic philosophical terms that were adopted by Hellenistic Judaism and then by Paul and other Christian writers⁽¹⁾. These word studies will clarify the problem of the cultural background of Paul’s argument. For example, Hellenistic writers could speak of the “eternal and divine power” of God which extends throughout the universe. Faint images of the “power” of the gods could be “seen” in certain animals. There was a portion of God’s “divinity” in matter. One Hellenistic writer discusses God’s power and divinity in the same text. νοούμενα was a word used almost exclusively by philosophers. It could appear in contexts where the mind processes perceptions. These linguistic usages show that Paul was using a vocabulary of philosophical concepts that were familiar to Hellenism. The fact that Paul uses words drawn from a philosophical vocabulary will also confirm our contention that Paul composed a rhetorical enthymeme to make his point in Rom 1,20. While the cultural background of Paul’s formulation has

⁽¹⁾ *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* CD ROM # C (U. Cal. Irvine, 1987) – (henceforth “TLG”). The works on this disk are listed in: *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae. Canon of Greek Authors and Works* (ed. L. BERKOWITZ–K. A. SQUITIER) (New York – Oxford ³1990).

been much investigated, the logic and the Hellenistic background of the language of the verse have not been extensively analyzed⁽²⁾. We will use the analyses of the logic and language of the verse to make some tentative hypotheses about the cultural context in which Paul developed his theology.

I. The Logic of Romans 1,20

Paul builds an argument in Rom 1,20 that contains the following crucial assertion for which he does not argue: God is known in God's works. The fact that this assertion is well at home in Hellenistic culture explains Paul's willingness to use it. The argument (an enthymeme) that Paul constructs in the verse uses the principle that God is known in his works to show that those who do not honor God are guilty.

(2) A. Seeberg believes that the statement that "God's power and divinity are known in the works of creation" belongs to an oral Jewish catechism about the nature of God (*Die Didache des Judentums und der Urchristenheit* [Leipzig 1908] 35). Seeberg's student H. Daxer argues that the background of the text is teaching about God in late Jewish literature and preaching combining biblical traditions such as Job 12,7-10, Ps 19,2, and traditions from popular philosophy (with reference to *De mundo* 6 and Cic., *Tusc.* 1.29 [28]; *Römer 1,21-2,10 im Verhältnis zur spätjüdischen Lehrauffassung* [Naumburg a.d. S. 1914] 9). P.J. Achtemeier finds the combination of creation traditions and the condemnation of idolatry in LXX texts to be the background of Rom 1,20 (e.g. Jer 10,12-15; Isa 40,18-22; 45,18-20; Wis 13,1-10). His collection of comparative material is the most comprehensive ("St. Paul, Accommodation or Confrontation" [Ph.D. diss., Union Theological Seminary, 1957] 63-71). S. Schultz argues that repentance and mission preaching in Jewish apocalyptic provides the best comparison with reference to *1 Enoch* 91.4ff., *T. Napht.* 3,4ff., *2 Bar.* 54,17ff. ("Die Anklage in Röm 1,18-32", *TZ* 14 [1958] 164-165). M. Pohlenz notes that the teaching about the natural knowledge of God used by Paul in Rom 1,20 was developed by the Stoa and taken up by Peripatetics, Platonists, and Philo. Paul's emphasis on guilt also shows that he is not immediately dependent on the Stoics ("Paulus und die Stoa", *ZNW* 42 [1949] 71-72). In reference to 1,20, E. Norden claims that knowledge of God based on God's works is a Stoic teaching and refers to *De mundo* 6 with its source Posidonius, *Corp. Herm.* 5, Wisdom 13, and texts from Philo (*Agnostos Theos* 26-28, 128). Previous scholars' comments on the Hellenistic language of the verse can be found in the notes in the linguistic section of this paper.

1. *The Logical Context of the Verse*

The logical context of the argument in 1,20 is fairly clear. Attention to the conjunctions (or argumentative markers) that signal steps in the surrounding argument helps to uncover the presuppositions Paul uses⁽³⁾. The γάρ in 1,20 shows that it supports the claim Paul made in 1,19 that God has made known certain things to people. The γάρ in 1,19b in turn supports 1,19a. What is knowable or known about God (1,19a) is clear to people *because* God has made it known to them — it is not a chance occurrence. The διότι in 1,19a then supports 1,18. Since certain things about God are known (1,19) by people God's anger (1,18) with them is explained. The γάρ in 1,18 in turn helps tie the entire argument into the rest of the text — supporting the theme in 1,17⁽⁴⁾. The διότι in 1,21 gives a further reason for Paul's statement in 1,20 that people are without excuse.

2. *The Enthymeme*

In 1,20 itself the εἰς τὸ εἶναι signals a conclusion within the argument. The result (or purpose) of people's awareness of God's

⁽³⁾ R. Wonneberger discusses various argumentative conjunctions similar to those appearing in this section of Romans ("Überlegungen zur Argumentation bei Paulus", *Theorie der Argumentation* [ed. M. SCHECKER] [Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik 76; Tübingen 1977] 279-282). See also: D. HELLMHOLM, "Enthymemic Argumentation in Paul: The Case of Romans 6", forthcoming in *Paul in his Hellenistic Context* (ed. T. ENGBERG-PEDERSEN) (Minneapolis 1993); F. SIEGERT, *Argumentation bei Paulus* (WUNT 34; Tübingen 1985); H.D. BETZ, *Galatians* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia 1979); W. WUELLNER, "Greek Rhetoric and Pauline Argumentation", *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition. In Honorem Robert M. Grant* (ed. W.R. SCHOEDEL-R.L. WILCKEN) (Théologie Historique 54; Paris 1979) 177-188; W. WUELLNER, "Paul's Rhetoric of Argumentation in Romans: An Alternative to the Donfried-Karris Debate Over Romans", *The Romans Debate* (ed. K.P. DONFRIED) (Minneapolis 1977) 152-174.

⁽⁴⁾ G. Kennedy calls 1,16-17 the "proposition" (*New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism* [Chapel Hill 1984] 153). Compare R. JEWETT, "Following the Argument of Romans", *WW* 6 (1986) 384. Among the large number of commentators who identify 1,16-17 (or 1,17) as the "theme" are: H. LIETZMANN, *An die Römer* (HNT 8; Tübingen 1928) 30; and C.E.B. CRANFIELD, *The Epistle to the Romans*. Vol. I (ICC; Edinburgh 1975) 87.

power and divinity is that they are without excuse⁽⁵⁾. What is important about this analysis is that 1,20a appears as an unargued premise of Paul's argument in 1,18ff. Paul's argument in 1,20 is in the form of a rhetorical enthymeme since it lacks a premise. An "enthymeme" can be understood in ancient rhetoric as a "syllogism drawn from likelihoods or signs" or as a logically incomplete syllogism⁽⁶⁾. We will adopt the second understanding of "enthymeme". More importantly enthymemes require the author and audience to share common assumptions. What Paul presupposes illuminates his position. He assumes that his audience will be willing to accept 1,20a without further argument. The church in Rome, one can assume, comprised individuals who were able to understand enthymemes like this and who were willing to affirm Paul's claim about the knowledge of God available to all human beings.

Rom 1,20 is an enthymeme of the following form. Minor Premise: The invisible things of God (God's eternal power and divinity) are perceived through the understanding from the creation of the world in God's works. Conclusion: Therefore human beings are without excuse (for not honoring God). The unstated major premise is something like the following: If people are aware of truth about God and suppress it by not honoring God, then they are without excuse (for not honoring God).

The unstated premise is almost identical with the beginning of 1,21 where it is clear that people knew God, but did not give God

⁽⁵⁾ This point is valid whether the clause is purpose or result. Compare BDR, §402.2 and H. SCHLIER, *Der Römerbrief* (HTKNT 6; Freiburg-Basel-Wien 1977) 54.

⁽⁶⁾ The first definition comes from Aristotle, *Anal. prior* 2.27 and compare *Rhet.* 1.2.13, 2.22.2-3 where enthymemes deal with contingent matters and usually have less premises than a syllogism. The second definition (and the one most often used) comes from Quint. 5.14.24. See H. LAUSBERG, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft* (Stuttgart 1990) §372. R.D. Seaton shows the difference between Aristotle's approach and the more formal emphasis on missing premises ("The Aristotelian Enthymeme", *Classical Review* 28 [1914] 113-119). Enthymemes are "assumptions used in public discourse" in J.C. Raymond's understanding of Aristotle ("Enthymemes, Examples, and Rhetorical Method", *Essays on Classical Rhetoric and Modern Discourse* (ed. R.J. CONNORS et al.) (Carbondale-Edwardsville 1984) 144. Compare HELLMHOLM, "Enthymemic Argumentation", §2.3.3.2.1.

glory and thanks. Any argument has to begin with some assumptions that are unargued for. If the logic of the argument is valid, and if the premises are true, then the conclusion is true. 1,20a has been called a *topos* or commonplace, and the significance of that term is that Paul assumes others (at the least his audience) will agree with his claim without argument⁽⁷⁾.

3. *Romans 1,20 and Hellenism's Knowledge of God*

The Hellenistic belief that God is known in God's work provides the closest logical parallel to Paul's position. The eighteenth-century scholar J. Wettstein was aware of many good comparative texts including Ps. Aristotle's *via positiva* in which he compares knowledge of the soul with knowledge of God: ἡ ψυχὴ... ἀόρατος οὖσα τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῖς ὁρᾶται... ταῦτα χρὴ καὶ περὶ θεοῦ διανοεῖσθαι, δυνάμει μὲν ὄντος ἰσχυροτάτου, κάλλει δὲ εὐπρεπεστάτου, ζωῇ δὲ ἀθανάτου, ἀρετῇ δὲ κρατίστου, διότι πάσῃ θνητῇ φύσει γενόμενος ἀθεώρητος, ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἔργων θεωρεῖται⁽⁸⁾. Unlike Paul, Ps. Aristotle does not use the principle to

(7) W.L. Knox calls the belief that the existence of God can be inferred from God's works a "commonplace" with reference to Xenophon, *Mem.* 1.4.3ff., *Corp. Herm.* 5.6ff., Ps.-Arist. *De mundo* 6.25, Wis 13,5, and Philo, *De decal.* 59ff. (*Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity* [London 1944] 31). Knox's use of the term "inferred" is unfortunate because that is precisely what Paul does not do in Romans 1,20a! Rather, as we will argue below, God is "perceived" in the works of creation. Knox does not carefully examine the logic of the material. J.C. Brunt notes that the term *topos* in classical rhetoric referred to stereotyped arguments used in courtroom situations. *Topoi* are the topics from which enthymemes are derived (with reference to Aristotle *Rhet.* 2.22.13-2.23.1; "More on the *Topos* as a New Testament Form", *JBL* 104 [1985] 496-498). Compare LAUSBERG, *Handbuch*, § 373-374.

(8) *De mundo* 6, 399b (ed. I. BEKKER, *Aristotelis Opera*, I [Berlin 1960]); J.J. WETTSTEIN, *Novum Testamentum Graecum*, II (1st ed. 1751-52; Graz 1962) 22. Cicero makes the same comparison as *De mundo* 6: *deum agnoscis ex operibus ejus sic ex memoria rerum... vim divinam mentis agnoscito* (*Tusc.* 1.28.70). Cicero also does not use the principle to condemn image worship, but uses it in a discussion of the nature of the human mind. Socrates finds the divine manifest in events: "Α χρὴ κατανοοῦντα μὴ καταφρονεῖν τῶν ἀοράτων, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν γιγνομένων τὴν δυνάμιν αὐτῶν καταμανθάνοντα τιμᾶν τὸ δαιμόνιον (Xen., *Mem.* 4.3.14). Unlike Paul, Socrates notes the invisibility of the gods and recommends that people follow the custom of the state (in obedience to the Delphic oracle) by offering sacrifices to the gods (*Mem.* 4.3.13-17). There is no condemnation of image worship.

condemn idol worship. He follows his statement of the principle concerning the knowledge of God by remarking on the image of himself that Phidias left on the shield of Athena's statue in the acropolis. The image could not be removed without destroying the statue. Ps. Aristotle compares this fact with the relationship of God to the cosmos who, without being in the middle of things, secures the harmony and preservation of all things⁽⁹⁾. He does not condemn the image of Athena! Stobaeus preserves a fragment from the philosopher Onatus (III BCE) in which God is seen by the mind: 'Ο μὲν ὦν θεὸς αὐτὸς οὔτε ὁρατὸς, οὔτε αἰσθητὸς, ἀλλὰ λόγῳ μόνον καὶ νόῳ θεωρατὸς· τὰ δ' ἔργα αὐτῷ καὶ ταὶ πράξεις [sic] ἐναργεῖς τε καὶ αἰσθηταὶ ἐντι πάντεσιν ἀνθρώποις⁽¹⁰⁾. Onatus, unlike Paul, follows this statement with a defense of polytheism: there is a God with supreme power, and the other gods differ in the power they possess⁽¹¹⁾. Themistius shares the same point of view concerning the ability to perceive God in God's works: τὴν θεοῦ φύσιν τὰ ποιήματα ἐπιδείκνυσιν⁽¹²⁾. But Themistius uses the general principle in a comparison with Constantine's acts which show his

Aristobulus quotes an Orphic tradition in which God is only seen by the mind: οὐδὲ τις αὐτὸν εἰσοράει ψυχὴν [sic] θνητῶν, νῷ δ' εἰσοράεται (Eus. *Praep. evang.* 13.12.5; ed. K. MRAS, *Eusebius Werke. Achter Band. Die Praeparatio Evangelica* [GCS 8.2; Berlin 1956] 192). Aristobulus' Orpheus continues with a general discussion of God's relationship to the earth, but says nothing of image worship. Seneca describes entering a temple for sacrifice, and a few lines later claims that God is seen by thought: *effugit oculos, cogitatione visendus est* (*Nat. Quaest.* 7.30.1-3). In other texts Seneca does condemn the worship of images, but not in this one (see note 49). Epictetus' God is visible in God's works: τὸν δ' ἄνθρωπον θεατὴν εἰσήγαγεν αὐτοῦ τε καὶ τῶν ἔργων τῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐ μόνον θεατὴν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξηγητὴν αὐτῶν (*Epic. Diss.* 1.6.19-20). Epictetus follows this with an exhortation for people to live in accordance with nature. In another context Epictetus mentions the making of statues for the gods without condemning the practice (*Diss.* 1.4.31 and see 2.8.14, 25, 26). A. FRIEDRICHSEN, "Zur Auslegung von Röm 1,19f.", *ZNW* 17 (1916) 166-167, makes many references to the perception of God in *Corpus Hermeticum* including: νόησις γὰρ μόνη ὁρᾷ τὸ ἀφανές (5.2); ὁ τῷ νοί θεωρητός, οὗτος ὁ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ὁρατός (5.10; ed. A.D. NOCK-A.J. FESTUGIERE, *Corpus Hermeticum. Tome I. Traité I-XII* [Paris 1983]). These hermetic texts do not function to condemn idolatry.

⁽⁹⁾ *De mundo* 6, 399b, 400a.

⁽¹⁰⁾ *Ecl. Phy.* 1.2.94; ed. T. GAISFORD, *Ioannis Stobaei Eclogarum Physicarum et Ethicarum Libri Duo* (Oxford 1850) 37.

⁽¹¹⁾ *Ecl. Phy.* 1.2.94-96, ed. GAISFORD, 38.

⁽¹²⁾ *Peri philanthrōpias ē Cōstantios* 3.a (TLG).

royal virtue to those who are able to be led from the works to the worker. As a pagan, Themistius could also not be expected to condemn image worship. These philosophical texts — especially *De mundo* — show that Paul could assume that the minor premise of his enthymeme (the invisible things of God...) would be acceptable in at least part of the surrounding Hellenistic culture⁽¹³⁾. The widespread presence of the principle in non-Jewish Hellenistic culture helps explain its presence in Paul's argument as an unargued assertion. It was probably more important to Paul that his audience in Rome would be willing to accept it as true. The logical form of the general principle that God is known in God's works is assertion. The authors who use it apparently find it to be self-evident.

The logical use of the general principle to condemn idolatry is another matter. The only author we have found who combines the principle with an argument against images of God is Josephus. Josephus writes that God is manifest in God's works: ἔργοις μὲν καὶ χάρισιν ἐναργῆς (*C. Ap.* 2.190). After mentioning this principle, Josephus argues against making images of God out of any materials (*C. Ap.* 2.191)⁽¹⁴⁾. It is certainly no accident that a Greek-speaking author who combines the principle with an argument against idolatry is Jewish⁽¹⁵⁾.

⁽¹³⁾ R. Liechtenhan sees a free (the source of which Paul was perhaps unaware) reminiscence of Ps. Aristotle's *De mundo* 5 [sic], a work he attributes to Posidonian philosophy (*Die göttliche Vorherbestimmung bei Paulus und in der posidonianischen Philosophie* [FRLANT 18; Göttingen 1922] 7).

⁽¹⁴⁾ Josephus uses the principle in a different context. Moses, according to Jos., recommends the study of God's nature in order to live well: ...θεοῦ πρῶτον φύσιν κατανοῆσαι καὶ τῶν ἔργων τῶν ἐκείνου θεατὴν τῷ νῷ γενόμενον... (*Ant.* 1.19). Jos. follows this with an introduction to Moses' account of creation.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Philo's well known arguments for the existence of God which comprise premises with conclusions about God's existence are different from Paul's unargued claim that God is known in God's works. See Philo, *Leg. All.* 3.32.97-99 (ed. and trans. F. H. COLSON-G. H. WHITAKER) (LCL; Cambridge, MA-London 1981) 366-369. Compare *de praem. et poenis* 41-42 and *de Spec. Leg.* 1.32-35, 3.185-189. Achtemeier reviews these and other arguments in Philo and notes their thoroughly Hellenistic character ("St. Paul", 79-84). See also G. KUHMANN, *Theologia naturalis bei Philon und bei Paulus. Eine Studie zur Grundlegung der paulinischen Anthropologie* (NTF 1.7; Gütersloh 1930) 7-37, B. GÄRTNER, *The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation* (ASNU 21; Lund-Uppsala 1955) 116-125, and P. WENDLAND, *Philos Schrift über die Vorsehung. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte*

4. Conclusion of the Logical Investigations

In the part of Hellenistic culture to which Paul belongs one can claim to have a sense of God's attributes as part of the basic experience of reality. This is true not only because of the comparative texts that have been presented, but because Paul assumes it as something not needing to be argued for. Paul used an idea from Hellenistic philosophy (that God can be perceived in God's works) in his enthymeme, but he gave it a decidedly Jewish flavor by linking the idea with the rejection of idolatry. To express his enthymeme he used words drawn from Hellenistic philosophy. The following investigation of Paul's language supports the interpretation of 1,20a as a perception of God's attributes of power and divinity by means of God's works in nature. The fact that Paul was willing to use philosophical words also supports our claim that Paul constructed an artful enthymeme.

II. The Language of Romans 1,20

One can compare Paul's language with the wide range of Greek now available to scholars on the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (TLG) disk. Below we will examine Paul's words for perception (νοούμενα καθορᾶται), the things in which God's attributes are perceived (κτίσεως, τοῖς ποιήμασιν), and what is perceived about God (τὰ ἄορατα, ἥ τε αἰδὶος δύναμις καὶ θεϊότης). The conclusion will be that most of these words are found overwhelmingly in philosophical contexts and that Paul probably derived them from philosophical texts of Greek-speaking Jews or from conversations with philosophically

der nacharistotelischen Philosophie (Berlin 1892) 8-16. A.S. Pease reviews numerous arguments for the existence of God from the point of view of teleology — the adaptation of organic life to some purpose ("Caeli Enarrant", *HTR* 34 [1941] 163-200). He includes Philo in his survey (*ibid.*, 189-190). D. Winston refers to teleological arguments (drawn from the purposiveness of the world) and to cosmological arguments (drawn from the order of the world) in Philo and other Hellenistic authors (*The Wisdom of Solomon. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB; Garden City 1979] 253, 256). D.T. Runia also notes the cosmological argument in Philo (*Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato* [Philosophia Antiqua 44; Leiden 1986] 272). In Wis 13,1-5 it is clear that pagans did not come to a knowledge of God, and so Wisdom does not share Paul's belief that pagans have a knowledge of God based on God's works which they suppressed. See further note 29 for bibliography on this point.

inclined Greek-speaking Jews. There is also the possibility that he learned them at an advanced educational level. The searches will also reveal that Christians energetically adopted the philosophical words. The word “without excuse” (ἀναπολογήτους) will be shown to come from a rhetorical context. Paul’s use of the word separates him from the Hellenistic use of images in worship. The evidence will yield a picture of Paul as an intellectual able to use philosophical concepts for his own purposes.

1. *The Perception of God’s Attributes: νοούμενα καθορᾶται*

A search on the expression νοούμενα καθορᾶται can help clarify the nature of the experience of God to which Paul alludes so briefly. The expression is (at least in its precise grammatical form) a creation of Paul. The closest combination of the two verbs I have found is: κατιδόντες τὰ πυρὰ καὶ νοήσαντες τὸ γεγονὸς from Polybius’ *Hist.* 2.26.2. In this text some outnumbered soldiers see camp fires and understand what has happened: their reinforcements have arrived. It is a combination of perception and understanding. The only places in Greek literature in which the expression occurs exactly as it does in Paul are in patristic commentaries on Paul’s text⁽¹⁶⁾. The patristic commentators do not understand it to be a purely intellectual process, but see it as a combination of conceptual thinking and sense perception. Ps. Basil, for example, argues after quoting 1,20 that: ἡ μὲν αἰσθητὴ τῶν ποιημάτων ἀντίληψις ὁρασις τάχα εἴρηται, ἡ δὲ νοητὴ τῶν ὑπερκοσμίων κατάληψις νόησις προσηγόρεται⁽¹⁷⁾. Clearly the exegete sees a combination of vision and understanding. Chrysostom has a similar understanding of the verse: Ὁ δὲ λέγει, τοιοῦτόν ἐστι· Τὴν κτίσιν εἰς μέσον προέθηκε πρὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν πάντων, ἵνα ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων τὸν δημιουργὸν στοχάζωνται⁽¹⁸⁾. Following this, Chrysostom quotes Wis 13,5. He

⁽¹⁶⁾ The search was done on the expression in its grammatical forms beginning with νοομεν and καθορ. It needs to be noted that the *TLG* does not include papyri and inscriptions, and that the process of recording all the literary authors is not complete. The search software is Pandora (developed by Harvard’s Perseus project) used on a MAC SE 30.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Ps. Basil, *Enarratio in prophetam Isaiam*, 5.161 (*TLG*). Compare ὁ μὴ ἐμβλέπων τοῖς ἔργοις, οὐδὲ πρὸς τὴν διὰ τοῦ νοῦ νόησιν ὁδηγεῖται for a similar view (5.156).

⁽¹⁸⁾ Chrysostom, *Ad populum Antiochenum (homiliae 1-21)*, 49.105 (*TLG*). See also his *Expositiones in Psalmos* 55, 195.

sees a combination of vision and thinking in Paul. A similar understanding of the text is present in Origen's exegesis of the verse: δι' ὧν ἔστιν εἰδέναι ὅτι εἰ καὶ τοὺς ἐν βίῳ ἀνθρώπους χρὴ ἀπὸ αἰσθήσεων ἄρξασθαι καὶ τῶν αἰσθητῶν, μέλλοντας ἀναβαίνειν ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν νοητῶν φύσιν, ἀλλ' οὐτὶ γε ἐν αἰσθητοῖς καταμένειν χρὴ⁽¹⁹⁾. These exegetes would reject the claim that vision is not involved in the process Paul describes. E. Käsemann translates the phrase: "Denn seit der Weltschöpfung wird er in seiner Unsichtbarkeit erfaßt und an dem Geschaffenen wahrgenommen"⁽²⁰⁾. He is not willing to interpret τοῖς ποιήμασιν νοούμενα as a parenthetical phrase since the participle agrees with ἄορατα⁽²¹⁾. In his translation Käsemann takes the participle with ἄορατα and καθορᾶται with ποιήμασιν. The verb καθορᾶται can be used for a non-visual process in philosophical or other abstract contexts, but its combination with νοούμενα here is an indication that Paul refers to a visual and intellectual process since it is unlikely that he intends the two words to be understood as meaning the same thing⁽²²⁾.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Origen, *Contra Celsum* 7.37 (TLG). The interpretation of Rom 1,20 in medieval exegesis is addressed by two scholars: W. VANDERMARCK, "Natural Knowledge of God in Romans: Patristic and Medieval Interpretation", *TS* 34 (1973) 36-52; and F.J.A. DE GRIJS, "Theologische Aantekeningen. Over enige Wijzen, waarop Romeinen 1,20 is Verstaan in de Traditie van de Rooms Katholieke Kerk", *Bijdragen* 30 (1969) 66-83.

⁽²⁰⁾ E. KÄSEMANN, *An die Römer* (HNT 8a; Tübingen 1974) 32.

⁽²¹⁾ KÄSEMANN, *Römer*, 36. If the verb were meant to be taken with "invisible things" (with the participial phrase as a parenthesis) one would expect a simpler construction, and in view of 2 Cor 4,18 and 5,17 he claims that Pauline theology would contradict a present "seeing". Paul's νοῦς is not a Stoic or mystical "eye of reason" that because of a God-given perceptual ability is adequate to understand supernatural reality; rather it is a critical understanding that recognizes the claims of a situation. Of these arguments the grammatical one seems strongest. In 2 Cor 4,18 Paul explicitly mentions a kind of present "seeing" (σκοποῦντων... τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα), and J. Behm notes the polyvalent nature of νοῦς in Paul ("νοέω κτλ", *TDNT* IV,958-959). In any case Paul makes it clear that God has given people the ability to perceive and understand certain things (1,19). Friedrichsen prefers to take the participial phrase as a parenthetical expression. Käsemann's translation is not far from Friedrichsen's point that: "Es handelt sich hier um ein Doppeltes, die sinnliche Wahrnehmung und das geistige Erkennen, beides in einem" ("Zur Auslegung", 164).

⁽²²⁾ Cranfield notes that the participle can be understood to be modal and refers both the participle and finite verb to physical sight (*Romans*,

P.O. Schjött contends that νοούμενα is a technical term for Philonic and Neo-Pythagorean “invisible ideas” with no reference to the subjective knowledge of the observers. He translates the text as: “The invisible thoughts of God, that stand forth since the creation of the world in his works, are evident; as is his eternal power and divinity”. God projects an intelligible world-structure; a design made of ideas. One grasps these ideas when one observes the world⁽²³⁾. Schjött’s position is not borne out by the use of the term

114-115). W. Michaelis gives evidence of the use of καθοράω in Philo. He notes that Leisegang’s index lists 34 usages (“ὁράω κτλ”, *TDNT* V, 379). The search done by the author on the *TLG* found 65 instances (and there may be some obscure forms I did not search for). Sense perception can be the meaning of the verb in Philo, but as in other philosophical authors such as Plato the term is used primarily for intellectual perception (e.g. *Leg. Alleg.* 2.57 οὐ γάρ πᾶσιν ἐπιτρεπτεόν τὰ θεοῦ καθορᾶν ἀπόρητα, ἀλλὰ μόνοις τοῖς δυναμένοις αὐτὰ περιστέλλειν καὶ φυλάττειν). Abraham “sees” God with the eyes of the soul: διοίξας τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ὄμμα καὶ καθορᾶν αὐγὴν ἀντὶ σκοτούς βαθέος βλέπειν ἀρξάμενος ἠκολούθησε τῷ φέγγει καὶ κατείδεν, ὃ μὴ πρότερον ἐθεάσατο, τοῦ κόσμου τινὰ ἡνίοχον καὶ κυβερνήτην ἐφεστῶτα... (*De Abrahamo* 70). In a usage that combines sense and intellectual perception Philo discusses the contemplatives’ preparation for their sacred feast: τὰς τε ὄψεις καὶ τὰς χεῖρας εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀνατείναντες, τὰς μὲν ἐπειδὴ τὰ θεᾶς ἄξια καθορᾶν ἐπαιδεύθησαν... (*de vita cont.* 66). He speaks of a non-sensory perception: κατιδεῖν ψυχικῶς τὸ σωφροσύνης κάλλος (*Leg. Alleg.* 2.81). Runia reviews physical sight and sight with the eye of the soul in Philo (*Philo of Alexandria*, 270-273). Michaelis argues that since νοούμενα refers to an intellectual process, Paul intends either a sense process of καθορᾶν which is simultaneously an intellectual νοεῖν or a purely intellectual process because of the modifier νοούμενα. The participle establishes the second possibility (a wholly intellectual process) according to Michaelis (*ibid.*, 380). The context (speaking of God’s works) is against his position because “works” are seen and understood in the majority of the uses of ποιήμασιν. The evidence given from Sextus below about νοούμενα will also show Michaelis is incorrect in his restriction of the meaning of the word in Hellenistic Greek. Several examples of the verb καθοράω with a noun for understanding are: Isoc., *De pace (orat.* 8), 141 τῇ διανοίᾳ καθορῶν; Damascius, *In Philebum* 254 ἐν τῷ νῷ καθορᾷ. And compare Plotinus, *Ennead.* 5.1.7 ἡ νόησις καθορᾷ.

⁽²³⁾ Without any lexical evidence whatsoever in P.O. SCHJÖTT, “Eine religionsphilosophische Stelle bei Paulus. Röm 1,18-20”, *ZNW* 4 (1903) 77-78. His position is criticized by FRIEDRICHSEN, “Zur Auslegung”, 159-161 and by D.A. KLÖPPER, “Die durch natürliche Offenbarung vermittelte Gotteserkenntnis der Heiden bei Paulus”, *ZWT* 47 (N.F. 12) (1904) 169-172. Klöpper refers to Plato, *Tim.* 30d where, in his view, the νοουμένων are ideas perceived by people. The other usages in Plato support Klöpper.

in Greek literature, although a Platonist philosopher could read Paul in terms of “invisible thoughts”⁽²⁴⁾. The term appears infrequently in literary sources prior to (and including) Plutarch⁽²⁵⁾. Of those occurrences only eleven are plural as in Rom 1,20. The usages all include an explicit or implicit reference to those who do the “understanding” as in Plato’s ἀναίσθητα ὅφ’ ἡμῶν εἶδη, νοούμενα μόνον (*Tim.* 51d). Sextus uses the term in a tradition about Anaxagoras in which the pre-Socratic questions whether snow is white and concludes that it is really black: νοούμενα δὲ φαινομένοις [ἀντιτιθέμεν] ὥς ὁ Ἄ. τῷ λευκὴν εἶναι τὴν χιόνα ἀντετίθει ὅτι ἡ χιὼν ὕδωρ ἐστὶ πεπηγός, τὸ δὲ ὕδωρ ἐστὶ μέλαν, καὶ ἡ χιὼν ἄρα μέλαινά ἐστιν⁽²⁶⁾. One value of Schjött’s hypothesis, in the light of the *TLG*, is that one can quickly see that the word is used overwhelmingly by philosophers⁽²⁷⁾. The word does not have to

(24) S. Strange, a scholar of Hellenistic philosophy, has told me in conversation that he suspects Paul may be referring to the famous passage in Plato’s *Timaeus* (39e) where the νοῦς or demiurge creates the world by looking at the ideas in the paradigm or νοητῷ ζῳῳ: ἡπερ οὖν νοῦς ἐνούσας ἰδέας τῷ ὃ ἐστὶν ζῳον, οἷαί τε ἔνεισι καὶ ὅσαι, καθορᾶ, τοιαύτας καὶ τοσαύτας διενεόηθη δεῖν καὶ τόδε σχεῖν. Strange would opt for the translation “invisible thoughts”. At the least a Platonist-minded reader would have probably understood Paul to be speaking of “invisible thoughts”. Plotinus (*Ennead.* 3.9.1) comments on the passage of Plato. Runia discusses the appropriation of the passage in Philo (*Philo of Alexandria*, 162-163). The controversy that Plato’s text engendered is discussed by J.M. DILLON, “Plotinus, *Enn.* 3.9.1 and Later Views on the Intelligible World”, *Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 100 (1969) 63-70. My thanks to Prof. Strange for his suggestions and comments on this essay.

(25) The classical equivalent is νοητά. The *TLG* search was done on the present middle-passive participle. Literary authors before 120 CE (an approximate date for Plutarch’s death) use the word 53 times (not including Paul).

(26) Sext. *Pyrr. hypot.* 1.33. Sextus used the participle 82 times, and Alexander of Aphrodisias used it 90 times. The Christians adopted it: Gregory of Nyssa is listed as having 255 uses in the *TLG* index with Origen having 123 uses.

(27) The plural forms are: Anaxagoras, *Testimonia*, Frag. 97 (Sext. *Pyrr. hypot.* 1.33); Dion. Halic., *Antiq. Rom.* 11.41.5; *De Lysia* 3 (used for “thoughts” in both instances); Heron Alex., *Definitiones* 136.134; Philo, *De mut. nom.* 5; *Leg. Alleg.* 2.73; Plato, *Respublica* 508c; *Tim.* 30d, 51d; Plut. *De genio Soc.* 589c; *Plat. quest.* 1002a. Diogenes Laertius uses the plural four times: two are used in connection with Zeno and the Stoics (7.52,141); and two in connection with Pyrrho and the sceptics (9.78,79).

refer to a purely intellectual process. Sextus Empiricus, for example, can use it in contexts where sense perception and conceptual processing of that perception are involved in relations such as “whiter”, “blackier”, and “sweeter”: πρὸς τι δέ ἐστι τὰ κατὰ τὴν ὥς πρὸς ἕτερον σχέσιν νοούμενα καὶ οὐκ ἐτι ἀπολελυμένως λαμβανόμενα, τουτέστι κατ’ ἰδίαν, οἷον τὸ λευκότερον καὶ μελάντερον καὶ γλυκύτερον⁽²⁸⁾. The term occurs so often in philosophical contexts that it appears that Paul was aware of it from some contact with the philosophical community. This is not to claim that Paul had read any of the philosophers in question. His consciousness of the use of a philosophical term at least shows his linguistic competence as a participant in Hellenistic culture. Paul’s creative combination of the words referring to perception and mind is hard to pin down semantically, but it does give a broad picture of how God’s invisible attributes can be available to human beings as a basic part of their experience. What is the source of this experience in the world? Paul uses the terms “works” to explain this source.

2. *Works: ποιήμασιν*

Paul may consciously avoid ἔργα, a term that occasionally appears in Stoic and other philosophical contexts in their arguments for God’s existence. Unlike Wisdom 13, Paul avoids some of the technical terms present in the Hellenistic arguments for the existence of God such as ἔργα and τεχνίτης⁽²⁹⁾. What then is the significance

⁽²⁸⁾ Sext., *Adv. Math.* 8.162 (*Adv. Log.* 2.162. LCL). Compare Diog. Laert., 7.141 τῶν δι’ αἰσθήσεως νοουμένων. Usages of νοεῖν such as these show that Behm needs a more nuanced position when he asserts that the verb lost its early meaning of “sense perception” in Hellenistic Greek (“νοέω κτλ”, *TDNT* IV,948, n. 2).

⁽²⁹⁾ Paul also avoids δημιουργός, ACHTEMEIER, “St. Paul”, 70-71, 82. E. Grafe argues that Paul is dependent on Wisdom 13 by pointing to linguistic similarities in Romans and Wisdom: ἐπίγνωσις in Rom 1,28 compared to ἐπιγιγνώσκειν in Wis 13,1; νοεῖν in Rom 1,20 and Wis 13,4; ἐσκοτίσθη ἡ καρδία in Rom 1,21 and ἀπετύφλωσε αὐτοὺς ἡ κακία αὐτῶν in Wis 2,21; the similar constructions ἀναλόγως θεωρεῖται in Wis 13,5 and νοούμενα καθορᾶται in Rom 1,20; and ἀσύνητος in Wis 11,15 and Rom 1,21 (“Das Verhältniss der paulinischen Schriften zur Sapientia Salomonis”, *Theologische Abhandlungen. Carl von Weizsäcker* [Freiburg 1892] 271-272). In Wisdom and Paul, Grafe sees a possibility of knowledge of God that was lost because of human sins. E. Gärtner argues that Paul thinks of an intentional struggle against the knowledge of God while Wisdom attributes a longing for God to people, but their intellect cannot

of ποιήμασιν, a word that occurs infrequently in the LXX in comparison with ἔργα⁽³⁰⁾? Claims are often made using LXX texts about the precise meaning of the word in its context in Rom 1,20 such as the following: it refers to works of creation and not acts of creation or works in history; it refers to works in creation and history but not to created beings as in Isa 29,16; it refers not to nature as God's work, but to God's deeds in history, in the life of individuals, and in nature⁽³¹⁾. Gärtner's conclusion appears to be the best given the evidence in the LXX: the term can apply to God's dealing in history, in the life of the individual or in nature⁽³²⁾. Since

make the simple inference from the perfection of the work to the Creator. This difference is so important, for Gärtner, that he believes a direct dependence of the apostle on Wisdom here is out of the question (*Komposition und Wortwahl des Buches der Weisheit* [Schriften der Lehranstalt für die Wissenschaft des Judentums 2.2-4; Berlin 1912] 92-93). J.M. Reese examines the Hellenistic philosophical elements present in the text of Wisdom 13,1-9 (*Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and its Consequences* [AnBib 41; Rome 1970] 50-62). He finds the difference with Paul to be that the Sage condemns pagans for not finding God (13,9), whereas Paul condemns pagans for having rejected God after having known him (*Hellenistic Influence*, 54). Winston also analyzes Hellenistic and Hellenistic Jewish elements in Wisdom 13,1-9 (*Wisdom*, 248-257).

⁽³⁰⁾ TLG has 29 occurrences in the LXX of ποίημα. ἔργα appears hundreds of times in the concordance of Hatch and Redpath (*A Concordance to the Septuagint* [Graz 1975] 541-544). It may be significant that ποίημα in the LXX appears most frequently (20 times) in Ecclesiastes, a work which has the most affinities with Hellenism of any work in the OT (M. HENGEL, *Judaism and Hellenism. Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period* [Philadelphia 1981] I,115-116).

⁽³¹⁾ Respectively: Schlier appeals to uses of ἔργον in Ps 8,7; 102,22 and Sir 42,16 for "works of creation" (*Römerbrief*, 52). O. Michel refers only to τὰ κρίματα in PsSal 8,7ff. for "works and deeds in creation and history" (*Der Brief an die Römer* [MeyerK; Göttingen 1963] 63). Gärtner argues that the LXX uses the word to refer to God's or people's deeds and not to the works of Creation (*Areopagus Speech*, 138). He is incorrect in the instance of Isa 29,16.

⁽³²⁾ *Areopagus Speech*, 138. H. Braun notes Ecclesiastes' use of the word in 3,11; 7,13; 8,17 and 11,5 for God's actions ("Ποιέω, κτλ", *TDNT* VI,460). In texts such as Eccl 3,11 the reference could include acts in history, individual lives, or nature. Hellenistic literature supports such a wealth of referential possibilities. Diogenes Laertius (1.35) has a tradition of Thales: πρεσβύτατον τῶν ὄντων θεός· ἀγέννητον γάρ. κάλλιστον κόσμος· ποίημα γάρ θεοῦ. Plutarch refers to Egyptians' tendency to identify the behavior of such things in nature as crops with the births and deaths of gods: οὕτως ἐκείνοι τοῖς τῶν θεῶν ὀνόμασι τὰ τῶν θεῶν δῶρα καὶ ποιήματα καλεῖν οὐκ

Paul does not choose to specify the precise reference of ποιήμασιν there is no need to restrict it to any specific aspect of creation. But in the context it is important that “works” need to be perceived by the senses to be processed conceptually⁽³³⁾. The “works” begin with the “creation of the world”. Here Paul uses the word κτίσις in a sense unknown to Hellenistic writers not in the Jewish tradition⁽³⁴⁾.

3. *What is Perceived about God: τὰ ἀόρατα, ἣ τε αἰδῖος δύναμις καὶ θειότης*

The invisible things of God that are perceived in God’s works, eternal power and deity, appear in both pagan and Jewish sources

ἐφείδοντο (*De Is. et Os.* 379ab). Aelius Aristides quotes Homer on the shield of Achilles: Ὅμηρος ἔφη τὴν τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως ἀσπίδα Ἡφαίστου ποίημα εἶναι (*Peri homonoias tais polesin*, 521,17).

⁽³³⁾ Neither the LXX uses of the word nor the Hellenistic uses given above justify Michaelis’ claim that ποιήματα are not processes that call primarily for sense perception (“ὁράω κτλ”, 380). Michaelis gives no lexical evidence for this reference of the word. The context in Eph 2,10 may show that ποίημα there refers to a process that is not open to sense perception (compare GÄRTNER, *Areopagus Speech*, 138, n.2). Such a reference to the effect of salvation is not obviously present in Rom 1,20. Michaelis’ conjecture that the word may refer to history is close to Gärtner’s, and ποιήματα would then require some use of the senses to be understood.

⁽³⁴⁾ The best parallels to Paul’s use of the word are in Hellenistic Jewish texts: φασὶ τὸ δένδρον ἀπὸ τῆς κτίσεως μέχρι νῦν διαμένειν (*Jos.*, *B.J.* 4.533); and ἀπὸ κτίσεως οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς (*PsSol* 8,7; “κτίσις”, *BAGD*, 455). H. W. Beyer discusses Hellenistic views of creation (“κτίσις”, *TDNT* II,1027-1028) as does H. Braun (“ποιέω, κτλ”, 458-459). Beyer notes that the LXX uses the word to mean “created thing” (*Tob* 8,5) or “all created things” (*Jdt* 16,14). Pagan authors (at least those prior to Arrian) did not use the word for “creation”. The *TLG* search uncovered 130 uses prior to and including Flavius Arrianus: LXX (16); Philo (1 in *De Vita Mos.* 2.51 of the “founding” of a city); *Jos.* (14 — most with reference to the founding of a city). The only reference to the act of a god found (in a non-Jewish author) was Pindar’s τελεῖ δὲ θεὸν δύναμις καὶ τὰν παρ’ ὄρκον καὶ παρὰ ἐλπίδα κούφαν κτίσιν (*Olympia* 13.82-3). *Diod. Sic.* uses the word in a typical expression used for chronological purposes: ἡ πόλις ἀπὸ τῆς κτίσεως (*Bibliotheca historica* 13.59.4). Hellenistic Judaism perhaps adapted the chronological expression “from the foundation of a city” by substituting its concept of creation. The Christians made good use of the word: Origen (196 times); Athanasius (422 times); Gregory of Nyssa (724 times); and Chrysostom (682 times).

although the “power” of God in paganism tends to be understood pantheistically⁽³⁵⁾. τὰ ἄορατα [θεοῦ] used to refer to God’s qualities or God in God’s invisibility appears to be an original formulation of Paul⁽³⁶⁾. Sextus describes the divine and

(35) G. Bornkamm discusses the identification of God and the world in Stoic thought (“Die Offenbarung des Zornes Gottes (Rm 1–3)”, *ZNW* 34 [1935] 243–246). W. Grundmann also examines the evidence for Stoic pantheism with reference to texts such as Alex. Aphr.’s ἡ δύναμις τῆς ὕλης ἐστὶ ὁ θεός (*Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta I–IV* [Leipzig 1903] II,1047, p.380.35 [henceforth “SVF”]; “δύναμαι κτλ”, *TDNT* II,287–288). He also treats Philo’s concept of power (*ibid.*, II,298). Von Arnim’s index refers to other texts (“δύναμις”, *SVF* IV,44). J. Dillon writes, in a summary of a text from Ps. Aristotle’s *De mundo* (398), of “the Power of God, which goes through all the Universe, where it is not fitting that God himself should go, any more than it is consistent with the dignity of a ruler to pay attention to all the minor details of his kingdom” [σεμνότερον δὲ καὶ προπωδέστερον αὐτὸν μὲν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀνωτάτω χώρας ἰδρῦσθαι, τὴν δὲ δύναμιν διὰ τοῦ σύμπαντος κόσμου διήκουσαν ἥλιον τε κινεῖν καὶ σελήνην...] (398b). Compare *De mundo* 396b, 397b, and 398a. Dillon also discusses “power” in Plato and Philo (*The Middle Platonists. 80 B.C. to A.D. 220* [Ithaca 1977] 161–162). The *TLG* index lists over 50,000 uses of δύναμις and only 225 for θεϊότης. Cicero gives a tradition of Epicurus in which the philosopher combined the concepts of “power” and “nature” of the gods that are perceived by the mind and not the senses: *docet eam esse vim et naturam deorum ut primum non sensu sed mente cernantur* (*De nat. deor.* 1.19.49 [LCL]). In *P. Oxy.* 1381.164–65 a writer describes being filled with Asclepius-Imouthes’ divinity: πληρωθεὶς τ. σῆς θεϊότητος. θεϊότης is used again in 1381.186. Later the author (1381.215–19) describes the god’s power: εἰς πάντα γὰρ τόπον διεπεφοίτηκεν ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ δύναμις σωτήριος.

(36) The author’s search on the *TLG* revealed no similar use of the phrase. The word only appears in the LXX three times and is not there used to describe God. The *TLG* index listed 232 uses (including the five in the NT) prior to and including Dio Chrysostom (death c.112 CE). Of 35 authors 12 were philosophers accounting for 188 of the uses: Aristotle (43); Plato (15); Philo (94); Plutarch (15 — some being in the biographies). Christians made frequent use of the word: Eusebius (260 times); Epiphanius (114 times); Chrysostom (251 times); and Origen (163 times). Xen., as an infrequent example of a pagan Hellenistic author, describes God as invisible: οὗτος τὰ μέγιστα μὲν πράττων ὁράται, τάδε δὲ οἰκονομῶν ἄορατος ἡμῖν ἐστίν (*Mem.* 4.3.13). Ps. Aristotle has a similar description: “Ὅταν οὖν ὁ πάντων ἡγεμὼν τε καὶ γενέτωρ, ἄορατος ὢν ἄλλω πλὴν λογισμῷ (*De mundo* 399a). Michaelis (“ὁράω κτλ”, 368–369) surveys the use of the word in Philo, Josephus and other Hellenistic Jewish texts. Philo describes God’s nature as invisible (...οὐδενὶ γὰρ ἔδειξεν αὐτοῦ τὴν φύσιν, ἀλλ’ ἄορατον αὐτὴν παντὶ τῷ γένει παρεσκεύασε *Leg. Alleg.* 3.206). God’s spirit is divine and invisible (τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἄορατου πνεύματος *De Plant.* 18).

eternal power that permeates the universe in the conclusion of an argument for God's existence based on the order of the universe (διακοσμήσεως): τοῦτο δὲ οὐκ ἄλλο τι πιθανόν ἐστιν εἶναι ἢ δυνάμιν τινα δι' αὐτῆς πεφοιτηκυῖαν... ἔστι τις ἄρα καθ' ἑαυτὴν αὐτοκίνητος δύναμις, ἥτις ἂν εἴη θεία καὶ αἰδῖος... αἰδῖος τοῖνυν ἐστὶν ἡ κινουσα τὴν ὕλην δύναμις...⁽³⁷⁾. Plutarch has an interesting use of the concept of seeing (καθοράω) "power" in nature in which he notes that the Egyptians honored the asp, weasel and dung beetle — seeing in them faint images of the power of the gods like the images of the sun in dew-drops: ἀσπίδα δὲ καὶ γαλῆν καὶ κύνθαρον, εἰκόνας τινὰς ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀμαυράς | ὥσπερ ἐν σταγόσιν ἡλίου τῆς τῶν θεῶν δυνάμεως κατιδόντες (*De Iside et Osiride* 380f-381a). The word for "divinity" is relatively rare in the period up to the end of the second century⁽³⁸⁾. U. Wilckens calls the

⁽³⁷⁾ *Adv. Math.* 9.75-6 (= LCL, *Adv. Phys.* 1.75-6). δύναμις appears hundreds of times in the LXX, but αἰδῖος appears only twice (Wis 7,26 and 4 Macc 10,15). H. Sasse discusses its use in Philo ("αἰδῖος", *TDNT* I,168). Starting with Plutarch's approximate date of death (120 CE) previous authors on the *TLG* use the word about 579 times of which 485 appear in philosophers. Of the 54 authors 29 are philosophers including: Aristotle (240 uses); Plato (15 uses); Philo (61 uses); and Plutarch (59 — although some are in the biographies). Plato calls the gods eternal (αἰδῖων θεῶν; *Tim.* 37c). Plutarch regards the notion of God's eternity as self-evident: θεὸν δὲ νοῶν μὴ νοῶν δ' ὁφθαρπον μὴδ' αἰδῖον ἄνθρωπος οὐδὲ εἰς γέγονεν (*De communibus notitiis contra Stoicos* 1075a). Christians adopted the term including: Clement of Alexandria (57 uses); Athanasius (153 uses); Gregory Nyssenus (193 uses); Origen (43 uses). None approached the love of the word in Aristotle's commentator Simplicius (920 uses)! Paul's use of it again indicates a participation in the philosophical community of Hellenism.

⁽³⁸⁾ 29 instances have emerged so far in non-Christian authors. BAGD ("θειότης", 354) list: Heraclit. Sto., *Quaest. Hom.* 76; Wis 18,9; *Ep. Arist.* 95; Philo, *Op. M.* 172 v.1.; Jos., *Ant.* 10.268; Plut., *Mor.* 398a, 665a; Lucian, *Calumn.* 17; Dit., *Syll.*³ 867.31 (II CE); *P. Oxy.* 1381, 165 (II CE). See also *P. Oxy.* 1381.186. A *TLG* search revealed the following references: Epicurus κα[λεῖ] δὲ καὶ τὸν θ[εῖο]ν τῆτος [βίον ἢ] διστον καὶ μ[ακαρι]ώτατον (*Epicurus, Deperditorum librorum reliquiae*, Treatise 19, frag. 2; ed. G. ARRIGHETTI, *Epicuro Opere* [Turin 1960]); a fragment mentions ἡ Ἀλεξάνδρου θειότης in *Tragica Adespota* 733, frA, cII, line 4 (ed. R. KANNICHT-B. SNELL, *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, vol.2 [Göttingen 1981]); Philo, *Quod det. pot.* 86; Plut., *Romulus* 28.6; *Aemilius Paullus* 24.4; *Sulla* 6.7; *Alexander* 28.6; the longing for the truth about the gods is a yearning for divinity — διὸ θειότητος ὄρεξις ἐστὶν ἡ τῆς ἀληθείας μάλιστα δὲ τῆς περὶ θεῶν ἐφεσις (*Mor.* 351e); in reference to some prophecies fulfilled by catastrophic

word a concept of Hellenistic religious philosophy⁽³⁹⁾. Philo uses it to explain people's knowledge (in their invisible souls) of the invisible God: ἄνωθεν ἐνέπνει τῆς ἰδίου θειότητος· ἢ δ' ἀόρατος ἀοράτῳ ψυχῇ τοὺς ἑαυτῆς τύπους ἐνεσφαγίζετο, ἵνα μηδ' ὁ περιγίγιος χώρος εἰκόνοσ ἀμοιρήσῃ θεοῦ⁽⁴⁰⁾. Plutarch speaks of God implanting a portion of life and divinity in matter:

ἐπεὶ τοίνυν οὐ πεπλασμένοις ὁ κόσμος οὐδὲ συνηρμοσμένοις ποιήμασιν ἔοικεν, ἀλλ' ἐνεστὶν αὐτῷ μοῖρα πολλὴ ζωότητος καὶ θειότητος, ἣν ὁ θεὸς ἐγκατέσπειρεν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ τῇ ὕλῃ καὶ κατέμιξεν, εἰκότως ἅμα πατὴρ τε τοῦ κόσμου, ζῶον γεγονότος, καὶ ποιητὴς ἐπονομάζεται⁽⁴¹⁾.

The word for "divinity" belongs to a philosophical community that Paul must have been aware of, although he probably was not referring to any philosopher's vocabulary in particular. Paul must have been aware of such philosophical discussions given his use of such specialized vocabulary. Paul's choice of these two qualities of God indicates that he understood them to be available to human beings. H. Langerbeck believes that Paul was focusing on philosophers as those who possessed this knowledge about God⁽⁴²⁾.

occurrences Plutarch writes, ταῦτα γὰρ εἰ γέγονε πιστεῦσαι χαλεπὸν ἔστι, μή τί γε προειπεῖν ἄνευ θειότητος (*Mor.* 398e); *Mor.* 407a; *Mor.* 411de; *Mor.* 415c; *Mor.* 975a; *Mor.* 1001b; *Ps. Plut., Placita philosophorum* 904e (= *De Placitis* 5.1 in H. DIEHLS, *Doxographi Graeci* [Berlin 1929]); Lucian, *Icaromenippus* 9; Albinus, *Epit. Doctr. Plat.* 10.3; Photius, *Bibliotheca* 187, 144b (from Nicomachus of Gerasa's *Theologoumena arithmeticae*). The Christians liked the word. Origen used it 89 times.

⁽³⁹⁾ U. WILCKENS, *Der Brief an die Römer. 1. Teilband Röm 1-5* (EKKNT 6.1; Zürich 1978) 106. Compare Käsemann who lists τὰ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ, αἰδὶος δύναμις, νοούμενα καθορᾶται, and θειότης as words that indicate the context of Hellenistic popular philosophy (*Römer*, 35). H. S. Nash argues very forcefully, based on the lexical evidence available to him, that there is no major difference between the words θειότης and θεότης, and that Paul does not distinguish between God's Being and attributes ("θειότης — θεότης, Rom. i.20; Col. ii.9", *JBL* 18 [1899] 5 and *passim*).

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Philo, *Quod det. pot.* 86.

⁽⁴¹⁾ Plut., *Platonicae quaestiones* 1001b.

⁽⁴²⁾ H. LANGERBECK, "Paulus und das Griechentum. Zum Problem des Verhältnisses der christlichen Botschaft zum antiken Erkenntnisideal", *Aufsätze zur Gnosis* (ed. H. DÖRRIES) (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-Historische Klasse 3.69; Göttingen 1967) 98-99. H. P. Owen writes: "Nevertheless it is clear that, whether Paul had the philosophers in mind or not, they too, according to

Διαλογισμοῖς and σοφοί in 1,21-22 buttress Langerbeck's argument. In any case the language of the verse is at home in the philosophical discourses of Hellenism (and in particular Hellenistic Judaism) although the precise wording is original. Of course Paul does not restrict the reference of αὐτοῖς in 1,19 to philosophers. But one can assume that he included them in his argument.

4. *Combinations of Key Terms*

It is least at interesting that a number of writers combine several of the words that Paul uses in 1,20 in various philosophical texts quoted above. Sextus combines αἰδῖος and δύναμις⁽⁴³⁾. Plutarch combines τῶν θεῶν δυνάμει with κατιδόντες⁽⁴⁴⁾. He also uses ποιήμασιν and θεϊότητος in another text⁽⁴⁵⁾. *P. Oxy.* 1381. 165, 186, 215-219 uses θεϊότητος and δύναμις to describe God⁽⁴⁶⁾. These examples indicate that Paul shares a common cultural background with the linguistic usage of these Hellenistic authors. Are these shared combinations merely coincidental? Paul's education may have brought him into contact with these philosophical concepts. Perhaps all one can claim is that talk about God in Hellenism was limited by the linguistic concepts available.

5. *Without Excuse: ἀναπολογήτους*

The conclusion of Paul's statement in Rom 1,20 (the ἀναπολογήτους phrase) would not be congenial to many Hellenists. The word is related to judicial rhetoric and reminds a reader of court

his principles, fell into idolatry of a subtler kind insofar as they were led to venerate the κόσμος as divine" ("The Scope of Natural Revelation in Rom. I and Acts XVII", *NTS* 5 [1958-59] 142). On the other hand, A. Bonhöffer argues that if Paul knew anything of Greek philosophy he would have mentioned in Romans that a pagan here and there had come near to the true knowledge of God; consequently Paul did not know Greek philosophy; and if Paul had looked even cursorily at a Stoic writing (such as Posidonius) he would have been unable to write Romans 1 and 2 as he did (*Epiktet und das Neue Testament* [Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 10; Gießen 1911] 150-151). Bonhöffer's argument from silence does not examine Paul's willingness to use philosophical terms and thoughts.

⁽⁴³⁾ *Adv. Math.* 9.75-6 (= LCL, *Adv. Phys.* 1.75-6).

⁽⁴⁴⁾ *De Iside et Osiride* 380f-381a.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ *Platonicae quaestiones* 1001b.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ See the texts in note 35.

scenes and public condemnation in the political process⁽⁴⁷⁾. Hellenists would take exception to the unstated major premise of the enthymeme: those who are aware of the truth about God and who suppress it are guilty⁽⁴⁸⁾. Surely they would deny that Hellenistic religion and philosophy were suppressing the truth about God. In other words they would not include themselves among those who suppress the truth about God. The idol worship Paul mentions in Rom 1,23 was probably a fixed element in the surrounding culture. That there were certain philosophers who criticized the worship of images is an exception to the rule⁽⁴⁹⁾.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ The word has overtones of judicial rhetoric as in Dio. Hal. where Decius lists a series of charges before the Senate against Gaius Marcus (Coriolanus) who remains ἀκριτον and ἀναπολόγητον (*Ant. Rom.* 7.46.4). Jos. uses judicial terms in discussing one of Apion's charges against the Jews including κατηγορία, ὁ κατηγορῶν, and ἐγκαλεῖ (*C. Ap.* 2.137). Plutarch mentions one of the only charges (ἐγκλημάτων) against which Brutus is ἀναπολόγητον (*Brutus* 46.2). Cicero uses the word to describe something that couldn't be more inexcusable at that time in the political process (*Rei publicae; ad Att.* 16.7). Prohaeresius leaves a section of a speech ἀναπολόγητον that deals with a question of rhetorical *status* — a part of judicial rhetoric (Eunapius, *Vitae Soph.* 10.5.3 [489]; and compare LAUSBERG, *Handbuch*, §89a).

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Bultmann notes that Paul adopts the Greek thought (concerning the knowledge of God) not because he was concerned with the problem of the knowledge of God in itself but in order to prove εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοῦς ἀναπολόγητους ("Untersuchungen zum Johannesevangelium", *ZNW* 29 [1930] 188). The individuals concerned are without excuse because they have a knowledge of God. In Hellenistic Judaism, Bultmann argues, Hellenistic terminology and the concept of the natural knowledge of God were adopted by Wisdom and later by Philo. Bultmann's hypotheses have been supported by the investigations of this article, and it seems most likely that Paul got his language from intellectual Jews with a philosophical bent. J.D.G. Dunn notes that Stoic language entered the Jewish wisdom tradition and that Paul followed Hellenistic Judaism in using the language as an "apologetic bridge" to Hellenistic philosophy (*Romans 1-8* [WBC 38; Dallas 1988] 57-58). "Stoic" is too narrow because the philosophical language was used in many traditions of ancient philosophy. Otherwise Dunn's hypotheses have also been supported by this essay.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ J. Geffcken refers to texts from Heraclitus, Zeno the Stoic, Lucilius, Varro ("the old Romans worshiped the gods for 170 years without images" — *Dicit etiam antiquos Romanos plus annos centum et septuaginta deos sine simulacro coluisse* in Aug., *De Civ. D.* 4.31 [CCSL 47, p.125.33-35]) and Seneca (in reference to the theatre, he writes that they dedicate [images] of sacred, immortal and impassible beings in vile and stationary matter — *Sacros, inquit, immortales, inuiolabiles in materia*

6. Conclusion of the Linguistic Investigations

The key words investigated above (νοούμενα καθορᾶται, τὰ ὁράτα, ἡ τε ἀϊδιος δύναμις καὶ θεϊότης) usually appear in philosophical contexts. All of them appear individually in Hellenistic Jewish authors (some only a few times). Perhaps the simplest assumption is that Paul gleaned them from encounters with other Jews who spoke excellent Greek. Hellenistic language only offered him a limited number of terms for philosophical and theological concepts, so it is natural that he shared their usage with Hellenistic philosophers. That fact of course does not mean Paul borrowed these terms directly from texts of Hellenistic philosophy any more than a modern who knows terms such as “magnetic resonance scans” has to be a physician or to have borrowed the medical language directly from medical texts⁽⁵⁰⁾. Paul’s linguistic competence does establish him as a well educated intellectual willing to use the tools he needed to communicate with his audience. The presence of Hellenistic philosophical concepts in Romans 1,20 also supports our claim that the text has a carefully formulated logic — namely that it is a rhetorical enthymeme.

uillissima atque immobili dedicant in Aug. *De Civ. D.* 6.10 p. 181.10-11; and see Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* 2.2.14) that criticize the worship of images (*Zwei griechische Apologeten* [Leipzig–Berlin 1907] xx, xxi). Zeno gives the clearest condemnation of such worship in Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 5.11.76 (ed. A. LE BOULLUEC, *Clément d’Alexandrie. Les Stromates... V Tome I* [Paris 1981]): λέγει δὲ καὶ Ζήνων ὁ τῆς Στωϊκῆς κτίστης αἱρέσεως ἐν τῷ τῆς πολιτείας βιβλίῳ μῆτε ναοὺς δεῖν ποιεῖν μῆτε ἀγάλματα· μηδὲν γὰρ εἶναι τῶν θεῶν ἄξιον κατασκευάσμα. Cicero’s Academic philosopher, Cotta, casts a very critical glance on the painters and sculptors who portray the gods and argues that the gods do not have the appearance of people or of heavenly bodies (*De nat. deor.* 1.29.81; 1.30.85). Lucian satirizes the belief that the statues of Pellichus (a general) and Hippocrates move (*Philops.* 20,21). He gives a similar account (*Syr. D.* 10, 35, 36) of the statues of gods in the Syrian temple (they move, sweat, and prophesy) and of Apollo’s statue (moves, sweats, and gives oracles). Such criticisms failed to change Porphyry (see his treatise ΠΕΡΙ ΑΓΑΛΜΑΤΩΝ (ed. J. BIDEZ, *Vie de Porphyre* [Hildesheim 1964; rep. of the 1913 ed.] Appendix 1-23) or the theurgist Iamblichus who expounds on matter’s ability to receive the gods (*de Myst.* 5.23.232-234; ed. and trans. É. DES PLACES, *Jamblique. Les Mystères d’Égypte* [Paris 1966]). R.L. Fox gives many references to the use of statues in late antiquity in processions, in helping a city ward off war and plague, and in many other civic contexts (*Pagans and Christians* [San Francisco 1986] 114, 133-137, 153-154, and see “statues” in the index, 797).

⁽⁵⁰⁾ I am indebted to P.J. Achtemeier for this insight, and I thank him for critical comments on this essay.

III. Suggestions about the Cultural Context of Paul's Theology

In this particular case it is obvious how enthymemes can be prime evidence for a culture or subculture. If one considers the culture of Hellenism as a set of "major premises", then the minor premise that Paul uses (God perceived in God's works) can be derived from that set of cultural assumptions⁽⁵¹⁾. The thinker who would reject this principle would have to reject a great deal of the dominant culture (such as the sceptics or an atheistic thinker like Diagoras of Melos). The belief in God perceived in the cosmos surely was an aspect of the dominant culture's social construction of reality. Whether such discussions ever took place outside of philosophical circles is a question for which this author has no answer. The literary evidence presented above comes from highly intellectual authors. Authors who believed that God could be perceived in the cosmos come from Peripatetic, Stoic, Pythagorean,

(51) Culture can be viewed as a set of major premises from which the minor premises can be derived according to the anthropologist J.L. PEACOCK, *The Anthropological Lens* (Cambridge 1986) 35. The terms "subculture", "dominant culture", and "counter-culture" are adopted by V.K. Robbins in an essay exploring the culture of the Gospel of Mark and 1 Corinthians with reference to the work of W. Wuellner ("Rhetoric and Culture: Exploring Types of Cultural Rhetoric in a Text", forthcoming Sheffield Academic Press). Robbins defines "dominant culture" as a "system of attitudes, values, dispositions, and norms supported by social structures vested with power to impose itself on people in a significantly bounded territorial region". A subculture is a cultural pattern that comprises "both sexes, all ages, and family groups, and which parallels the larger society in that it provides for a network of groups and institutions extending throughout the individual's entire life cycle" (ibid., 4 quoting K.A. ROBERTS, "Towards a Generic Concept of Counter-Culture", *Sociological Focus* 11 [1978] 112). A subculture affirms the "national culture and the fundamental value orientation of the dominant society". A counter-culture rejects the dominant society's values. The counter-culture comprises "cultural heretics trying to forge a new future, not aliens trying to preserve their old culture". Counter-culturalists try to create a better society, but not by legislation or by violence. Robbins writes: The value conflict of a counter-culture with the dominant society "must be one which is central, uncompromising, and wrenching to the fabric of the culture. The concept of counter-culture also implies a differentiation between the two cultures which is more distinct than the areas of overlap" (Robbins, 11 with reference to Roberts, ibid., 121). K.A. Roberts (ibid., 111-126) develops the distinctions between these terms that can be useful in understanding the developing Christian culture of which Paul was a part.

Neo-Platonic, and other circles. Each of these philosophical movements could be described as a subculture that affirmed the values of the dominant society even though they may have felt they were better examples of those values⁽⁵²⁾. Philosophical symposia such as those “described” in Plato’s dialogues and the discourses of Plutarch may have had their counterparts in Hellenistic Judaism, but we are in the realm of speculation. The Hellenistic belief in the gods was surely one of the mainstays of their culture, and so any claim that God could be perceived in the cosmos might have been welcomed by the dominant culture. Those beliefs helped keep the priests in business and could not, for example, have hurt the emperor cult.

The Christians share the minor premise of Paul’s enthymeme with the Hellenists, but part company when it comes to the unstated major premise of 1,20 (that is actually stated in 1,21). Paul’s attitude toward Hellenistic religion and its attendant philosophy set him apart from the dominant culture, although he is using Hellenistic thoughts and concepts to make his point. His rejection of idolatry (part of the premise) sets him in a counter-cultural position to the dominant culture⁽⁵³⁾. The New Testament (and especially the Gospels) later appeared to be the rejection of all that was valued by the dominant culture of Hellenism. The Hellenistic critics of the NT were clear in their rejection of Christianity as a counter-culture that did not follow many of the norms and values of Hellenism⁽⁵⁴⁾. The conclusion of Paul’s argument shows his departure from the dominant Hellenistic culture of his time. His counter-cultural condemnation of image worship was a rejection of a norm that united the dominant culture. Paul was willing, however, to use tools of the dominant culture, including thoughts about God and philosophical terminology, in order to communicate to the Roman church. The tools may have come to him through Hellenistic Judaism. Those very tools became part of the developing Christian

⁽⁵²⁾ See the definitions of various types of culture in the note above.

⁽⁵³⁾ It is clear that some Hellenistic authors also rejected the worship of images. Certainly they were also “cultural heretics” or “counter-culturalists”. That some of them were Stoics raises the question of whether one should call Stoicism a “subculture” or a “counter-culture”. See note 51 above.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ See the author’s “Some Hellenistic Responses to the Gospels and Gospel Traditions”, *ZNW* 84 (1993) 233-254.

culture as the adoption of the philosophical terms by later Christian writers indicates. Paul's skill in rhetoric and his use of sophisticated philosophical language are evidence of a high level of education. If he was educated in Tarsus, he might have had some encounters with the schools of rhetoric and philosophy there⁽⁵⁵⁾. In any case the investigations of this essay have cast Paul in a highly intellectual light. Can one not assume that such intellectuals also existed in his audience in Rome? If not, how could he have expected to communicate using the philosophical thoughts and words that he used? Paul developed his theology in Romans 1,20 using some of the most powerful tools Hellenistic culture could provide him.

La Grange College
601 Broad St
La Grange, GA 30240 USA

John G. COOK

SOMMAIRE

Un examen de la logique et du langage de Rm 1,20 révèle l'habileté de Paul à employer les instruments philosophiques de la culture gréco-romaine. Le verset est un enthymème basé sur un adage philosophique hellénistique: «Dieu est connu par les œuvres de Dieu»; il veut prouver la culpabilité de ceux en qui l'idolâtrie élimine la connaissance de Dieu. Paul choisit des termes qui manifestent sa familiarité avec les discussions philosophiques. Le recours à ce type de langage pour communiquer avec l'église de Rome indique que la culture intellectuelle et de l'auteur et de ses destinataires était de haut niveau.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ Strabo describes schools of philosophy and rhetoric in Tarsus along with the rich intellectual life of the city that included philosophers, grammarians, and poets (14.5.13-15). W. Ruge approves of the expression "university of Tarsus" ("Tarsos", *PWRE* series 2, vol. 4, 2423). Hellholm discusses the possibility of Paul's early education in Tarsus and includes a reproduction of a fourth-century depiction of Paul as a Hellenistic-Roman philosopher ("Paulus fra Tarsos. Til spørsmålet om Paulus' hellenistiske utdannelse", *Dionysos og Apollon. Religion og Samfunn i Antikkens Hellas* [ed. T. EIDE-T. HÄGG] [Bergen 1989] 264-266).

Two Contrasting Eschatologies at Qumran (4Q246 vs 1QM)

Recently emerging into the full light of day, 4Q246, an Aramaic fragment first acquired in 1958 from cave 4 at Qumran, has occasioned quite a stir. This is primarily on account of the enigmatic figure bearing the provocative title, "son of God", who appears in its lines. Not surprisingly, so far the discussion has centered around an attempt to identify this figure⁽¹⁾. During the course of the debate, it has been suggested by Florentino García Martínez that 4Q246 is "a typical product of the sect's theology", and that its eschatology is coherent with the eschatology of the *War Scroll*⁽²⁾. John J. Collins has acknowledged that this assumption is "open to question", but has chosen to grant it⁽³⁾. This is in part due to verbal parallels that exist between the fragment and 1QM. There is a reference to the kings of Assyria and Egypt in 4Q246 1,6, which is paralleled in 1QM 1,2,4, where the "Kittim of Assyria" and the "Kittim in Egypt" are mentioned. In addition, the rare word נחשירון/נחשיר, "carnage" (a Persian loan-word), is found in both 4Q246 1,5 and 1QM 1,9⁽⁴⁾.

⁽¹⁾ A full publication, detailed description, and analysis of the fragment can be found in É. PUECH, "Fragment d'une Apocalypse en araméen (4Q246 = pseudo-Dan^d) et le 'Royaume de Dieu'", *RB* 99 (1992) 98-131. J.A. FITZMYER also provides a detailed treatment in "4Q246: The 'Son of God' Document from Qumran", *Bib* 74 (1993) 153-174. Other recent discussions include J.J. COLLINS, "The *Son of God* Text from Qumran", *From Jesus to John*. Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge (ed. M. C. DE BOER) (JSNTSS 84; Sheffield 1993) 65-82; F. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, "The Eschatological Figure of 4Q246", *Qumran and Apocalyptic*. Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran (Leiden 1992) 162-179; D. FLUSSER, "The Hubris of the Antichrist in a Fragment from Qumran", *Immanuel* 10 (1980) 31-37; J.T. MILIK, "Les modèles araméens du livre d'Esther dans la grotte 4 de Qumrân", *RevQ* 15 (1992) 383; and M. HENGEL, *The Son of God*. The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish Hellenistic Religion (Philadelphia 1976) 45.

⁽²⁾ "Eschatological Figure", 178-179.

⁽³⁾ "Son of God Text", 74-75.

⁽⁴⁾ *Ibid.*, 72.

It is almost universally agreed that at least the final redaction of 1QM is the product of the Qumran community. Do these parallels between 1QM and 4Q246 support the conclusion that the fragment was authored at Qumran, or that its eschatology is coherent with Qumranite expectations? It will be argued here that, in the process of focussing the debate on the cryptic "son of God" figure, some scholars have lost sight of the forest for the trees. Far more clearly discernable in 4Q246 than the identity of the "son of God" is an eschatological scenario that combines in a striking way themes from Daniel 7⁽⁵⁾ with echoes of the biblical peace-oracles (Zech 9,10; Hos 2,18; Isa 2,4; Mic 4,3). What is particularly noteworthy about this eschatological scenario is the profound *contrast* it presents to the eschatology of 1QM, and this notwithstanding the fact that 1QM also borrows motifs from Daniel (albeit from Dan 11,30–12,1 rather than from Daniel 7). Assyria and Egypt are traditional enemies of Israel. Given the prominent role these two nations play throughout the history of Israel, their presence in both 1QM and 4Q246 can easily be attributed to coincidence. The common Persian loan-word is scarcely more significant. Jubilees and 1 Enoch bear closer parallels to the Qumran texts, in that both attest to the distinctive Qumran calendar. Yet it is known that neither of these works was authored at Qumran. The profound differences between the eschatologies of 1QM and 4Q246 far outweigh the minor verbal parallels between them. While none of the Aramaic texts published so far have been unequivocally classified as Qumran compositions, it will be argued here that 4Q246 offers a clear example of an Aramaic text that unequivocally was *not* authored at Qumran.

This is not to suggest that the covenanters were incapable of inconsistency. As Collins has cautioned, "the expectations of the community should not be harmonized into a systematic body of doctrines. Rather we must reckon with the persistence of diverse conceptions side by side in the same community"⁽⁶⁾. This must

⁽⁵⁾ There are also many parallels to Daniel 2, but the majority of these overlap with those in Daniel 7. Daniel 7 is the later work, usually dated to the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, although an earlier version may have been written prior to this time. It is obviously dependent on Daniel 2. The eschatological structure and overtones of 4Q246 would suggest that the fragment is more closely related to Daniel 7 than to Daniel 2.

⁽⁶⁾ J. J. COLLINS, *The Apocalyptic Imagination* (New York 1989) 139.

certainly be recognized, but there is a range of variation beyond which the community would not be expected to have trespassed. It will be argued here that 1QM and 4Q246 simply lie too far apart on the eschatological spectrum for both to have been authored at Qumran.

Before this can be argued, some methodological difficulties need to be addressed. Firstly, how can one justifiably compare the eschatology represented in an incomplete fragment of nine lines and two cols. to the overall perspective found in the nineteen extant cols. of 1QM? The comparison can be made because 4Q246 presents in compact form a remarkably fully developed eschatological scenario. There is, in short, enough material there to extract its eschatology and to make a comparison with the perspectives found in other works — even those which, like 1QM, are substantially more protracted.

The MS from which 4Q246 derives is small; the spacing at its top and bottom indicates that the original text itself contained no more than nine lines⁽⁷⁾. Because the MS was vertically torn, only half of the first col. has reached us. The fact that the second col. ends with a construct form (תהומי, “abysses”) indicates that the original text contained at least one further col., and there may have also been one or more cols. preceding col. 1⁽⁸⁾. The small size of the MS, however, would suggest that the original text did not include a large number of cols. total. While logical inconsistencies even in a text this small are not impossible, it would seem reasonable to assume that the degree of logical contradiction present within such a text would have been limited. Thus, it would seem reasonable to conclude that the missing cols. of 4Q246 would have reflected a perspective relatively consistent with the extant portion.

The composite nature of 1QM⁽⁹⁾ complicates matters, especially given the lack of consensus regarding which layers of

(7) See PUECH, “Fragment”, Planche I.

(8) COLLINS, “*Son of God Text*”, 66.

(9) Yigael Yadin’s opinion that 1QM “is basically the work of a single literary hand — drawing of course from other sources for the various subjects dealt with” (*The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness* [Oxford 1962] ix) has been largely abandoned. Increasingly, the scholarly consensus has been moving towards the view that 1QM is a composite work. Fragments from six MSS resembling 1QM have been found in cave 4, and these seem to confirm the hypothesis of a

1QM are earlier and which layers later. For instance, there has been an ongoing debate between Collins and Philip R. Davies regarding the dualistic material in the scroll⁽¹⁰⁾. Collins, following J. van der Ploeg, suggests that the section representing the earliest stratum or "core work" of 1QM is found in cols. 1 and 15-19, which contain a good deal of the dualistic material. The remaining cols. supply details of armament and liturgy that were probably later additions to the core work⁽¹¹⁾. Davies envisages a considerably more complex redaction-history for the scroll, and one that reverses the order in which the dualistic and liturgical/military material is seen by Collins to have developed. While conceding that the final form of cols. 15-19 is dualistic, Davies argues that this section is the end-product of a long history of development from an original Maccabean war-rule. Battle-narratives and liturgical passages which are largely "neutral" have been linked together with dualistic passages providing the "framework" which interprets the war in dualistic terms. The dualistic col. 1 is "largely redactional", representing the latest stage in the development of 1QM. Dualistic terminology found outside of cols. 1 and 15-19 is also attributed to secondary additions and glosses. The remaining cols. originally derive from various sources: cols. 2-9 represent a Hasmonean compilation of

complex redaction-history for 1QM. See M. BAILLET, *Qumrân grotte 4, III* (DJD 7; Oxford 1982) 12-72, pls. V-VIII, X-XVI, XVII, XXIV, XXVVI; id., "Les manuscrits de la Règle de la guerre de la grotte 4 de Qumran", *RB* 79 (1972) 217-226; J. DUHAIME, "Étude comparative de 4QM^a fgg. 1-3 et 1QM", *RevQ* 14 (1989-90) 459-472.

⁽¹⁰⁾ J.J. COLLINS, "The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll: A Point of Transition in Jewish Apocalyptic", *VT* 25 (1975) 596-612; P.R. DAVIES, "Dualism and Eschatology in the Qumran War Scroll", *VT* 28 (1978) 28-36; COLLINS, "Dualism and Eschatology in 1QM: A Reply to P.R. Davies", *VT* 29 (1979) 212-215; DAVIES, "Dualism and Eschatology in 1QM: A Rejoinder", *VT* 30 (1980) 93-96.

⁽¹¹⁾ "Mythology", 605, n.43. Collins follows J. VAN DER PLOEG, *Le rouleau de la guerre*. Traduit et annoté avec une introduction (STDJ 2; Leiden 1959) 11-22. A similar explanation of the literary complexities of the scroll is offered in G. VERMES, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. Third Edition (London 1987) 104. The "primitive work" (cols. 1 and 15-19) describes the final battle against the Kittim in dualistic terms. "This account was later combined with the concept of a holy forty years' war against the entire Gentile world, and was extended by the addition of a long series of Rules concerned with the military and religious preparation and with the conduct of the fighting" (cols. 2-14).

traditions which arose during and immediately after the Maccabean wars, applied to an eschatological war in which the twelve tribes of Israel vanquish the nations; 1QM 10-12 was originally a collection of hymns and prayers, many of which reflect a Maccabean setting; cols. 13 and 14 existed as independent fragments, later incorporated into the work⁽¹²⁾.

Whether the dualistic passages of 1QM were composed early or late in the redaction-history of the scroll, they constitute nonetheless, as Davies suggests, the *interpretive framework* of 1QM in its final form. This is the case whether that framework is the skeleton, fleshed out by later liturgical and military material, or whether Hasmonian war-rules and other texts have been set within a dualistic schema which is the end-product of a complex redaction-history involving a series of secondary additions and glosses⁽¹³⁾.

There is another difficulty in that the final sheet of 1QM suffers from major lacunae. On this sheet, only one col. (col. 19) is partially preserved, and its exact location on the sheet cannot be established, although there are traces of one col. following it⁽¹⁴⁾. 1QM is by no means free of logical inconsistencies. Indeed, it will be shown here that a doublet within 1QM contains a traditional notion logically incompatible with the overall perspective of the scroll, a phenomenon that arises from 1QM's composite nature. Nevertheless, the nineteen extant cols. of 1QM, whatever their redaction-history might have been, do display a certain degree of *coherence*. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the missing concluding cols. of 1QM also contained material relatively coherent with 1QM's overall perspective.

Specifically, then, the comparison proposed here will be between the eschatology represented in 1QM as a *final product*, irrespective of its precise redaction-history, and the eschatology found in 4Q246, assuming the fragment to be a reasonably accurate representative of the lost document from which it derives.

(12) 1QM, *the War Scroll from Qumran*. Its Structure and History (BibOr 32; Rome 1977) 21, 123; "Dualism" (1978), 31-32.

(13) It is irrelevant to the argument here whether the dualistic structure and terminology of 1QM's interpretive framework derived originally from the Qumranites themselves or whether the covenanters assimilated them from a broader context.

(14) YADIN, *War Scroll*, 247-248.

I. The Eschatology of 4Q246

The MS of 4Q246 has been copied in a Herodian hand typical of the last third of the first century BCE. On paleographical grounds, the MS has been assigned a date of around 25 BCE⁽¹⁵⁾. Below is

*Col. 1**Parallels*

- 1 [...] settled [u]pon him, he fell before the throne
- 2 [...] O King, forever! You are angry, and changed
- 3 [...] is your gaze. But you [] everything forever!
- 4 [...g]reat (pl.). Distress shall come upon the earth;
- 5 [...] and great carnage in the provinces
- 6 [...] the king of Assyria [and E]gypt
- 7 [...] will be great (s.) upon the earth
- 8 [...] they will make and they will all serve
- 9 [...g]reat he shall be called, and by his name he shall be named.

Dan 12,1
Mark 13,19 *

*Col. 2**Parallels*

1. He shall be hailed (as) son of God, and they shall call him son of the Most High. Like comets
2. that one sees, so shall their rule be.
For (some) years they shall rule upon
3. the earth and shall trample everything (under foot);
people shall trample upon people, province upon province,
4. [vacat] Until there arises the people of God,
and everyone rests from the sword.
5. (Then) his kingdom (shall be) an everlasting kingdom,
and all his ways (shall be) in truth. He shall jud[ge]
6. the land with truth, and everyone shall make peace.
The sword will cease from the land,
7. and all the provinces shall pay him homage.
The great God is himself his might;
8. He shall make war for him.
Peoples He shall put in his power, and all of them
9. He shall cast before him. His dominion (shall be)
an everlasting dominion, and none of the abysses of ...

Dan 7,23
Isa 19,2; Mark 13,8 *
4 Ezra 13,31
Or. Sib. 3,635-36
Dan 7,18.22.27
(See line 6)
Dan 7,27
Zech 9,10; Isa 2,4
Mic 4,3; Hos 2,18
Dan 7,14.27
Hos 1,7
Dan 4,34; 7,14

* Mark 13,19 = Matt 24,21 = Luke 21,23.
Mark 13,8 = Matt 24,7 = Luke 21,10.

⁽¹⁵⁾ FITZMYER, "4Q246", 156; and PUECH, "Fragment", 105, in agreement with Milik's assigned date.

reproduced a translation of the text (without reconstructions of its lacunae), aligned with some of the more significant parallels found in other literature that are relevant to this discussion⁽¹⁶⁾.

It is the figure designated “son of God” and “son of the Most High” in the first line of the second col. around which much of the debate has centered. The text does not state that the figure will actually be the son of the Most High, but that he will *be called* the son of the Most High or might possibly even *designate himself* as such (the Aramaic allows for both possibilities)⁽¹⁷⁾. J. T. Milik offers a historicizing interpretation and argues that the figure is the last Seleucid king, Alexander Balas (150-145 BCE), son of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, who used the Greek title Θεοπάτωρ and the Latin title “Deo Patre Natus” on the coins of his realm, thus proclaiming himself to be “son of God”⁽¹⁸⁾. Émile Puech also allows for the possibility of a historicizing interpretation, suggesting that perhaps the figure is Antiochus IV himself. But Puech seems to prefer the interpretation that the figure represents a Davidic Messianic king⁽¹⁹⁾. Joseph A. Fitzmyer protests that such an interpretation eisegetically imports Messianism into the text — more precisely, the figure represents a coming Jewish ruler, perhaps a member of the Hasmonean dynasty, who would be a successor to the Davidic

(16) The following presentation of the text is derived primarily from FITZMYER, “4Q246”, 155-166, supplemented by PUECH, “Fragment”, 106-122. At line 3, the word “you” has been added to Fitzmyer’s translation, given that *אתה* is clearly present in the text. Puech’s translation is in substantial agreement with that of Fitzmyer, except at 4Q246 1,2-3. His divergent translation of these lines is as follows: “ô roi, Depuis toujours tu t’irrites et tes années... ta vision et toute chose. Toi, à jamais...”. The following are the main points of contention: (1) Puech takes *שניך* (1,2) to be the m.pl. substantive, *שניך*, with the second m.s. pronominal suffix (“your years”). Fitzmyer interprets it as the verb *שני* (“be changed”) with a second m.s. non-accusative pronominal suffix with a referent subject which he reconstructs as “the complexion of your face” for the lacuna at line 3, modelled on Dan 5,6. (2) While Puech takes *חזוך וכלא* (1,3) to be a compound object (“ta vision et toute chose”), Fitzmyer does not. Both Fitzmyer and Puech offer numerous parallels to the text found in both the biblical and extra-biblical literature. I have selected out those I deem most relevant to the present discussion.

(17) FLUSSER, “Hubris”, 33.

(18) “Modèles”, 383.

(19) “Fragment”, 122-131.

throne, but who is not envisaged as a Messiah⁽²⁰⁾. For García Martínez, the figure is the archangel Michael who plays such an important role in 1QM, a hypothesis which he predicates on his presupposition that 4Q246 was authored at Qumran⁽²¹⁾. While Collins grants the latter presupposition, he rejects the notion that the figure is angelic in favour of the Messianic interpretation⁽²²⁾. D. Flusser has proposed that the figure is the Antichrist⁽²³⁾.

It is not the purpose here to weigh the merits and shortcomings of each of these hypotheses one against the other. While issue is obviously being taken with García Martínez and Collins with respect to the suggestion that 4Q246 is coherent with Qumranite expectations, this does not mean that the mysterious figure cannot be either Messianic or the archangel Michael. The extensive lacunae in the first col. of the fragment will probably never allow for a decisive conclusion with respect to this cryptic figure. The basic features of 4Q246's eschatological scenario are largely independent of the exact identity of the "son of God", whether he be an historical, Messianic, or heavenly character, or even if he is the Antichrist. The figure's identity would have some effect on the degree to which 4Q246's eschatological scenario overlaps with the heavenly realm, and on other *details* of the scene depicted, but not on the larger brushstrokes that define its basic outline.

Leaving aside the more oblique sections of the text, certain distinctive features emerge clearly from the fragment's extant lines. There is a *vacat* immediately preceeding "until there arises the people of God" in 4Q246 2,4. This *vacat* marks a sudden transition from the period of eschatological distress to the reign of God's people⁽²⁴⁾. The contrast between these two periods is pronounced. The period before the transition is characterized by distress

⁽²⁰⁾ "4Q246", 173-174.

⁽²¹⁾ "Eschatological Figure", 178-179.

⁽²²⁾ "Son of God Text", 74-82.

⁽²³⁾ "Hubris", 33.

⁽²⁴⁾ Ibid., 35. Puech argues that יקם could be read יקמ in 2,4, rendering it "until he causes the people of God to arise". Also the defectively written יי in 2,6 could equally be read יי as יי, which would render it, "he will cause the sword to cease from the land" ("Fragment", 117). God would most likely be the subject understood here. Thus these alternatives would serve to reinforce God's agency in bringing about the transition marked by the *vacat*.

overwhelming the whole earth (1,4; cf. Dan 12,1 and the Synoptic Apocalypse [Matt 24,7 = Mark 13,8 = Luke 21,10]) and “great carnage in the provinces” (1,5), involving traditional enemies of Israel — explicitly, Egypt and Assyria (1,6). Lines 1,7-9 are obscure. Depending on how one interprets the “son of God” figure of 2,1 these lines could describe the build-up of an evil kingdom (following Flusser, Milik, and Puech [a]) whose rule is doomed to be exceedingly violent and brief (2,1-3); or, perhaps referring back to the equally obscure 1,1-3, the text may be alternating, after the manner of Daniel 7, between scenes of the eschatological distress and scenes of a throne (in the fragment this throne may be human) and of the divinely ordained leader of God’s people, whether angelic or human (following García Martínez, Fitzmyer, Collins and Puech [b]). The former model would locate the primary role of the “son of God” within the period before the *vacat*, while the other interpretations would allow the figure a role to play both before and after the transition. But the precise role this figure plays in 4Q246’s eschatological vision does not significantly affect the transition itself, nor the basic features that characterize the periods before and after it.

The period of distress and carnage preceeding the *vacat* involves the temporary and short-lived emergence of a powerful nation or perhaps nations, during whose rule violence and chaos reign supreme (2,1b-3): “Like comets that one sees, so shall their rule be. For (some) years they shall rule upon the earth and shall trample everything (underfoot); people shall trample upon people, province upon province...”. This is a commonplace in apocalyptic literature (a similar phrase occurs already in Isa 19,2). In *Or. Sib.* 3,635-36 we read that “king captures king and takes his land, and nations ravage nations, and rulers (ravage) people”. In the Synoptic Apocalypse, it is declared, “Nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom” (Matt 24,7 = Mark 13,8 = Luke 21,10). The same idea is later expressed in *4 Ezra* 13,31: “And they will plot to attack one another, city against city, locality against locality, people against people, and kingdom against kingdom”.

Then comes the abrupt transition (2,4) to the reign of “the people of God”, who correspond to “the saints of the Most High” in Dan 7,18.22.27⁽²⁵⁾. The third-person masculine singular references

⁽²⁵⁾ A number of scholars, including Collins, are of the opinion that “the saints of the Most High” in Daniel 7 are heavenly beings rather than

that follow this transition might refer back to “the people of God” as a collective entity⁽²⁶⁾ or, alternatively, they may refer to a chosen individual who rules and represents the people of God. This ruler may or may not correspond to the “son of God” figure in the fragment, but if not, there is no clear antecedent named in the text’s extant lines. It is possible that a ruler is intended who corresponds to the “one like a human being” of Dan 7,13, as Collins has suggested⁽²⁷⁾.

It is not explicitly stated that the people of God will defeat the wicked kingdom via warfare⁽²⁸⁾. One thing, however, is abundantly clear. Once the people of God have arisen, a reign of universal peace is immediately established. This is stressed no less than *three* times — “and everyone rests from the sword” (2,4b); “and everyone shall make peace” (2,6a); “The sword will cease from the land” (2,6b) — in language recalling the oracles of universal peace found in Zech 9,10; Hos 2,18; Isa 2,4 and Mic 4,3. This last-mentioned doublet (the wording in the two passages is nearly identical) also involves the figure of a universal judge, as in 4Q246 2,5b-6a (“He [or the people] shall judge the land with truth”).

This peaceful kingdom is “an everlasting kingdom” (2,5; cf. Dan 7,27) to which all the provinces will pay homage (2,7; cf. Dan

human. See J.J. COLLINS, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis 1993) 313-317, and 313, n.322, for a select list of scholars of the same opinion; opposing scholars are listed in *ibid.*, n.323. This view has encountered significant opposition. See esp. G.F. HASEL, “The Identity of ‘The Saints of the Most High’ in Daniel 7”, *Bib* 56 (1975) 173-192; and A.A. DiLELLA, “The One in Human Likeness and the Holy Ones of the Most High in Daniel 7”, *CBQ* 39 (1977) 1-19.

⁽²⁶⁾ As suggested by HENGEL, *Son of God*, 45, in accordance with the collective interpretation of Dan 7,13.

⁽²⁷⁾ “*Son of God* Text”, 80-82. For Collins, the “one like a human being” of Dan 7,13 is the archangel Michael. Thus, according to Collins, 4Q246 has interpreted this passage of Daniel by fusing the heavenly figure of Dan 7,13 with the traditional hope for a Davidic Messiah. The figure of Dan 7,13 has, of course, engendered much controversy. The major modern interpretations include: (1) an exalted human being, Messianic or other; (2) a collective symbol; (3) a heavenly being, either Gabriel or Michael (see COLLINS, *Daniel*, 308-310, for an outline of these positions and their main adherents). It is worthy of note that these three interpretations correspond very closely to the possibilities for the third-person singular references that follow the *vacat* in 4Q246.

⁽²⁸⁾ FLUSSER, “Hubris”, 35.

7,14.27). Its dominion is over all the “peoples” of the earth, whom God has placed in its power (2,8b-9). Whether one accepts Fitzmyer’s reconstruction at the end of 2,9, “none of the abysses of the earth shall prevail against it”, or Puech’s “tous les abîmes de la terre lui obéiront”⁽²⁹⁾, the general import is the same — that is, the complete subjugation of the cosmos and all of its inhabitants to the “everlasting dominion” (2,9; cf. Dan 4,34; 7,14) of the people of God.

The expression, “The great God is himself his might; He shall make war for him” (2,7-8a) is best understood as indicating that by his direct intervention, independently of human warfare, God himself will sustain the peaceful dominion of his people (2,8b-9). The thrice-repeated stress that the reign will be a peaceful one and that the sword will be put to rest, immediately preceding the statement that God will make war on the people’s behalf, makes it unlikely that human warfare plays any part in the reign of God’s people. In declaring that God himself will make war to safeguard the kingdom, 4Q246 is offering the only solution to the inevitable problem of how the dominion of God’s people is to be ensured in the absence of human military force. This stands in contrast to the more traditional understanding of Deut 1,30; 3,22; 7,21-23; 20,2-4, where God’s participation ensures the victory of human battles. Hos 1,7, on the other hand, is explicit in separating human warfare from God’s salvation: “...I will save them — not by bow, sword or battle, or by horses and horsemen, but by the Lord their God”.

This eschatological vision has distinct apocalyptic overtones. Puech has designated 4Q246 an “Aramaic apocalypse” or “pseudo-Daniel^d”⁽³⁰⁾; its prior siglum was 4QpsDan ar^a. The data do not permit one to judge for certain whether 4Q246 formed part of an apocalypse, but because of the fragment’s clear parallels in particular with Daniel 7, these are not inapt designations. It may be more than a coincidence that Daniel 7 is also written in Aramaic. Although the emphasis on peace, reflecting the traditional oracles, is greater in 4Q246 than in Daniel 7, there are frequent verbal echoes and similar themes. However, the most striking resemblance between the fragment and Daniel 7 is the underlying *structure* of

⁽²⁹⁾ “4Q246”, 156; “Fragment”, 109.

⁽³⁰⁾ As indicated by the full title of Puech’s article, “Fragment”.

their eschatologies. Features of the old Canaanite-type myth of the conflict with the forces of chaos⁽³¹⁾ emerge plainly in both works.

In Daniel 7 the adversaries are four beasts who arise from the sea. These beasts represent kings as well as kingdoms, but in addition they symbolize the chaotic power that these kingdoms embody. Ultimately they are violent powers in revolt against the God of heaven⁽³²⁾. The beasts are symbols of chaos and this chaos is reduced to order by God who hands over the dominion to his holy people (Dan 7,18.22.27; cf. 4Q246 2,4). While the fragment does not reproduce the sequence of four beasts, it most certainly also presents a scene of universal chaos and violence reduced to order by God who establishes and sustains the everlasting kingdom of his people. In addition, the mention of the abysses in 4Q246 2,9 recalls the mythical motif of the sea in Daniel 7. The abyss (or the deep) in the Hebrew Bible has connotations associated with the primordial flood, or floods of water. As in Daniel 7, in 4Q246 the dominion of evil and chaos in creation is only temporary — “like comets that one sees” (2,1b-2a) — brilliant but fleeting. For God himself intervenes to establish peace, order, justice, and harmony for all nations under the dominion of his people.

II. The Eschatology of 1QM

On the grounds that both the weapons and the tactics described in 1QM correspond on a number of points to Roman practice, and because the Kittim are represented as the masters of the world, Geza Vermes dates the final composition of 1QM to some time after the middle of the first century BCE, perhaps as late as the beginning of the first century CE⁽³³⁾. Davies suggests that the final redaction of 1QM might even date to late in the first half of the first century CE⁽³⁴⁾.

⁽³¹⁾ COLLINS, “Mythology”, 601.

⁽³²⁾ COLLINS, *Imagination*, 82; id., “Was the Dead Sea Sect an Apocalyptic Movement?”, *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin (ed. L. H. SCHIFFMAN) (JSPSS 8; Sheffield 1990) 28.

⁽³³⁾ *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 104.

⁽³⁴⁾ *1QM*, 123-124.

The main subject of 1QM is the eschatological war that will take place between the "sons of light" and the "sons of darkness", the purpose of which is "eternal annihilation for all the lot of Belial... without a remnant" (1QM 1,5-6)⁽³⁵⁾. In each camp are angels who also participate in the battle. The entire holy congregation is to participate in the first six years of the war, waged against three main groups: 1) Israel's neighbours and traditional enemies (Edom, Moab, Ammon, etc...); 2) the Kittim or the Romans; and 3) the offenders against the covenant or apostate Jews. The first phase of the battle will end after the "sons of light" and the "sons of darkness" have each been victorious three times, with the final victory being handed over to the "sons of light" in the seventh lot by the intervention of God. At the conclusion of the first phase and its subsequent sabbatical year, the fight is to be continued by selected units from the tribes of Israel for twenty-nine years, with four intervening sabbatical years (totalling thirty-three years), against the remaining nations. Altogether, the war will extend over a forty-year period⁽³⁶⁾.

The apparent concern of 1QM is to indicate how the war must be prepared and conducted, simultaneously according to pagan tactical rules and to Jewish laws concerning war enumerated in the Torah⁽³⁷⁾. Yigael Yadin has proposed that 1QM is an authentic military manual, designed for use in an actual war which the sect expected to wage in the near future⁽³⁸⁾. A recent article by Jean Duhaime comparing 1QM to Greco-Roman tactical treatises lends some support to this hypothesis⁽³⁹⁾. However, the highly idealized character of 1QM has led many commentators to consider it almost impossible for this treatise to have been intended for a real war⁽⁴⁰⁾. As Davies has framed it, 1QM is "idealistic and utopian, describing an elaborate ballet in which the villains conveniently fall down dead

⁽³⁵⁾ YADIN, *War Scroll*, 258. All citations of 1QM given here are from this translation.

⁽³⁶⁾ Ibid., 4, 20-21, 36-37.

⁽³⁷⁾ J. DUHAIME, "La Règle de la guerre de Qumrân et l'apocalyptique", *ScEs* 36 (1984) 69.

⁽³⁸⁾ *War Scroll*, 15.

⁽³⁹⁾ "The *War Scroll* from Qumran and the Greco-Roman Tactical Treatises", *RevQ* 13 (1988) 133-151.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Ibid., 151.

on cue" (41). Duhaime suggests that 1QM might be viewed as a type of utopian tactical treatise, in which the usual pragmatic or theoretical purpose of the military treatise was turned into a religious and utopian one (42). Whether 1QM was drawn out for an actual eschatological battle anticipated by the covenanters, or whether its purpose is more religious and utopian, its genre is in full harmony with its particular brand of eschatology — that is, an eschatology founded on a profoundly dualistic world-view.

While ancient wisdom is generally recognized to presuppose a unified cosmic order, the world of 1QM is divided into two conflicting orders (43). There are two "lots" (לֹט) in the cosmos — in effect, two cosmological divisions — Belial's lot (1QM 1.1.5.11; 4,2; 13,2.4.5.11-12) and God's lot (1,5; 13,5; 15,1; 17,7), also called the "lot of light" (13,9), the "lot to be redeemed" (17,6), and "the lot of thy truth" (13,12) (44). Angels participate actively in the battle, on both sides. The eschatological conflict can be sketched as follows: on the one side stand Belial, his angels and the people of his lot, the sect's enemies. On the other side is Michael (17,6) or the "Prince of Light" (13,10), with the covenanters of God's lot, aided by his angels (45). It is noteworthy that the opposition does not lie between God and Belial directly, but between Michael and Belial, to whom equal measures of power are apportioned. There is a sense in which God himself stands outside the conflict (46). Indeed, God's absolute sovereignty seems to leave him remote from the dualistic struggle depicted, so much so that the final victory over Belial is primarily attributed to Michael (see 1QM 17,6-7) (47).

(41) P. R. DAVIES, "Qumran and Apocalyptic or *Obscurum per Obscurius*", *JNES* 49 (1990) 133.

(42) "Greco-Roman Tactical Treatises", 151.

(43) J. J. COLLINS, "Patterns of Eschatology at Qumran", *Traditions in Transformation* (ed. B. HALPERN-J. D. LEVENSON) (Winona Lake, IN 1981) 375.

(44) M. J. DAVIDSON, *Angels at Qumran* (JSPSS 11; Sheffield 1992) 224-225.

(45) *Ibid.*, 219-220. Although the "Prince of Light" and the angels of his dominion are never explicitly said to belong to God's lot, it is consistent with the conceptual framework of 1QM to place them in this camp (227).

(46) *Ibid.*, 228.

(47) J. DUHAIME, "Dualistic Reworking in the Scrolls from Qumran", *CBQ* 49 (1987) 51.

1QM's dualism is, therefore, more *cosmological* than it is metaphysical. The scroll's monotheistic stress on God's ultimate sovereignty does little to mitigate this profound cosmological dualism. There is no significant spatial dualism, however. In 1QM the spiritual and material worlds are complementary to each other — angelic and human beings are classified together into the two opposing cosmological divisions of the universe, with the human beings subordinate to their angelic counterparts. To be sure, this classification does involve ethical dualism, a commonplace in traditional wisdom literature (e.g., Proverbs, Ben Sirach, the book of Wisdom). But the ethical dualism of traditional wisdom literature does not give way to the profound cosmological dualism that pervades 1QM⁽⁴⁸⁾.

1QM's cosmological dualism is alien to the book of Daniel. It has often been declared that 1QM is inspired by Daniel, in particular Dan 11,30–12,1. Unquestionably, motifs and characters drawn from Daniel, such as the Kittim, the notion of cosmic warfare and the participation of angelic beings (including Michael) in human affairs, have been assimilated into 1QM's dualistic cosmology. However, Collins has argued compellingly that 1QM's basic structure differs fundamentally from that of Daniel. While the book of Daniel reflects the Canaanite chaos-myth, 1QM's basic structure is traceable to Persian influence. The exact balance of Persian dualism is reflected in the fact that the battle is equally apportioned between the angel of light and the angel of darkness until the time of God's intervention⁽⁴⁹⁾. Whether or not one agrees that 1QM's

⁽⁴⁸⁾ For an excellent and very helpful summary of the various types of dualism and their presence in the Qumran and Wisdom literature, see J. DUHAIME, "Le dualisme de Qumrân et la littérature de sagesse vétérotestamentaire", *Église et Théologie* 19 (1988) 401-422.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ "Mythology", 604-608. As Davies has objected, it is difficult to countenance Collins' suggestion that 1QM represents a fundamental shift in Jewish apocalyptic eschatology at large, as if this broad and complex phenomenon had progressed in a straight line through Daniel and 1QM ("Dualism" [1978], 30). Collins has conceded that there are later books, such as Revelation, which are closer to Daniel than to 1QM. While historical patterns evolve, they do not do so along even, homogeneous, neat trajectories. Collins himself has recently cautioned that we should be wary of attempting to explain all differences between individual works by developmental theories ("Genre, Ideology and Social Movements in Jewish Apocalypticism", *Mysteries and Revelations. Apocalyptic Studies Since the*

dualistic structure can be traced to Persian influence, the contrast with Daniel is unmistakable.

Dualism as a feature of the Qumran perspective is not confined to 1QM alone. Duhaime has listed 11 additional texts from Qumran that reflect a distinctly dualistic perspective: 1QS, 1QpHab, CD, 1QH, 1Q27, 4QpPs37, 4QCry, 4Q^cAmram, 4Q180-81, 4QWiles, 11QMelch⁽⁵⁰⁾. To this list can be added 4Q280-82, 4Q286-87, 4Q508, and 4Q171 (4QpPs^a). In particular, 1QS presents a similar dualistic cosmology in the doctrine of the two spirits (1QS 3-4). Not only does 1QS use the terminology of light and darkness and speak of the lots of Belial and of God, but it also asserts that God has established the spirits of light and of darkness in equal measure until the final age when he will destroy the spirit of darkness, together with all who walk in his ways, again without remnant. 1QS 4,23b-26, however, also involves a psychological dualism, in which the contrast between good and evil is internalized as two impulses or principles waging battle within the individual human being⁽⁵¹⁾. Such psychological dualism is absent in 1QM.

Because 1QM's dualism is essentially cosmological, it locates evil squarely within the division of the cosmos that is the "lot of Belial". In order to eradicate evil, therefore, it is necessary to purge the cosmos of Belial's "lot" or to destroy the "sons of darkness", "without a remnant". Thus 1QM's dualism gives rise to the central purpose of the eschatological war — that is, the utter annihilation of those belonging to the "lot of Belial". There is little possibility of hyperbole here. Not only is it repeatedly stressed that *all* of the enemy is to be slaughtered (1QM 1,4-5.6-7.9-10; 3,9-10; 4,1-2.4.12-13; 9,6-7; 11,10-11; 13,16; 14,5.7-8; 15,2; 18,1-5.11), but the elaborate and protracted plan of the forty-years' war, as it stands in the final version of 1QM, has as its primary and explicit aim the extermination of every last nation of the known world, so that only the covenanters or the "sons of light" remain.

A doublet in 1QM seems to contradict this explicit goal of the eschatological battle. Except for a few variants, the text of 19,1-8 is almost identical to that of 12,7b-15. According to Davies, two

Uppsala Colloquium [ed. J.J. COLLINS-J.H. CHARLESWORTH] [Sheffield 1991] 20).

⁽⁵⁰⁾ "Le dualisme", 403-404.

⁽⁵¹⁾ Ibid., 416-418.

originally independent hymns (19,1-2a and 19,2b-8) have been pieced together and are presented in the same order in both cols. 19 and 12⁽⁵²⁾. The second hymn is of special interest here, for although it is full of violent imagery in harmony with the general tenor of the scroll, it also speaks of the subjugation of all nations to Israel, a traditional biblical notion that is logically incompatible with the dualistic framework of 1QM. For it is not possible for Israel to subdue and dominate their enemies if every last one of the wicked, classified as all those who are outside the community according to 1,1-2b, has been wiped off the face of the earth. In Davies' view, the second hymn is in accordance with the spirit of cols. 2-9, where the goal is the dominion of Israel over all the nations⁽⁵³⁾. Even if one sees, along with Davies, what was originally (before the addition of the dualistic glosses) a Hasmonean compilation of nationalistic bent in cols. 2-9, with which this hymn would then indeed be in harmony, the final recension of 1QM envisions nothing less than the utter annihilation of the wicked. Therefore, whatever might have been the hymn's original context, it is logically incompatible with the final version of 1QM, a phenomenon that seems to result from the scroll's composite nature. It should be kept in mind, however, that this logical inconsistency is not blatant, for the violent imagery of the hymn, so fully in harmony with the tenor of the scroll, serves to mask it quite effectively.

The dualistic framework of 1QM provides the overriding perspective of the scroll, and it is within this framework that 1QM's eschatology is primarily embedded. It has been a matter of considerable debate as to whether or not this eschatology can be classified as *apocalyptic* eschatology. Opinions range from those who have declared 1QM to be an apocalypse to those who would deny that it contains any apocalyptic elements whatsoever. Between these two extremes there is a whole gamut of nuances⁽⁵⁴⁾. The absence of an otherworldly mediator or of any explicit reference to revelation is what has led some commentators to see no apocalyptic aspect to 1QM⁽⁵⁵⁾. Duhaime acknowledges that 1QM is not an

⁽⁵²⁾ 1QM, 82.

⁽⁵³⁾ Ibid., 103.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ DUHAIME, "Règle", 67-68. Duhaime presents a survey of the scholarly opinions on this subject (71-82).

⁽⁵⁵⁾ E. g., see J. CARMIGNAC, "Qu'est-ce-que l'apocalyptique? Son emploi à Qumrân", *RevQ* 10 (1979) 26.

apocalypse, but has suggested that Qumran has its own particular understanding of revelation. The mysteries of God have been made accessible to the community by virtue of the privileged knowledge that God has transmitted to the Teacher of Righteousness. This knowledge is not in itself a new revelation, but is an unveiling of the hidden meaning of scripture (see 1QpHab 7,1-14)⁽⁵⁶⁾. Collins also proposes that the Teacher of Righteousness serves as the official mediator of revelation for the community, one who does not seem to require the services of an interpreting angel. While the scrolls depart from the conventions of the apocalypses in this regard, “the concept of mystery is very similar”⁽⁵⁷⁾.

The cohabitation of angels with human beings is a reality well attested at Qumran, not only in 1QM 10,8-11, but also in 1QH 3,20-23; 11,10-14 and in 1QS 11,6-9. As Duhaime has observed, all of these texts imply that participation in the heavenly realm at Qumran is no longer the effect of a temporary exaltation, as in the apocalypses. Instead it has acquired a permanent character — that is, by adhering to the community one participates in the heavenly realm⁽⁵⁸⁾. In this way, participation in the community’s ritual and structure becomes a fundamental aspect of its apocalyptic eschatology. Collins has suggested that at Qumran structure and ritual are inherently related to its apocalypticism. Thus, Qumran does not fit the stereotype that apocalyptic groups are antistructural and antiritualistic, but supports the view that apocalypticism retains the imprint of the particular tradition in which it develops⁽⁵⁹⁾. 1QM, with its elaborately contrived, cultically pure holy war, has all the trappings of a finely tuned, carefully structured religious ritual. Thus, it is very much in harmony with Qumran’s highly ritualized apocalypticism. Its profound dualism reflects the extreme exclusivism of the covenanters.

III. Comparison and Conclusion

The primary focus of 1QM is on eschatological judgment, retribution, and the annihilation of the wicked. When 1QM quotes

⁽⁵⁶⁾ “Règle”, 83-84.

⁽⁵⁷⁾ *Imagination*, 121.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ “Règle”, 85-87.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ “Patterns”, 375; *Imagination*, 141.

Deut 20,2-4 (“for your God goes with you, to fight for you against your enemies” [1QM 10,4-5]), it does so with human warfare very much in mind. The explicit aim of 1QM is to meticulously plot out a cultically pure holy war in which the covenanters act as God’s agents to exterminate the wicked “without a remnant”. There is little vision in 1QM of what comes after the wicked have been destroyed. Beyond a brief and standard note that the covenanters “shall be glad in eternal knowledge” (1QM 17,8) and that they will have peace, joy, and blessing (17,7), no clear details of the future existence of the covenanters, once the slaughter has been completed, are given⁽⁶⁰⁾.

It is true that some further description may have been provided in the missing cols. of the final sheet of the scroll. 11QMelch, which reflects a dualism similar to that of 1QM, refers explicitly to an eschatological day of peace, quoting the peace-oracle of Isa 52,7. It is important to note, however, that this peaceful reign of God occurs *after* Melchizedek (possibly to be identified with Michael), with the aid of all the “gods”, has exacted vengeance upon the spirits of Belial’s lot. Whatever period of peace might have been described in the missing cols. of 1QM, it clearly would have followed after the completion of the eschatological war — that is, after all the members of Belial’s lot had been annihilated from the face of the earth. The tacit assumption seems to be that by exterminating the wicked, or purging the cosmos of its evil parts, the expected consummation is fulfilled. Since only the covenanters and their angelic counterparts remain, the time of peace, blessing, and long life is for the “sons of light” alone (1,9).

By contrast, 4Q246 focusses on universal transformation brought about by the establishment of the reign of God’s people, after an eschatological crisis. The wicked are not to be annihilated by the just. Instead, all the nations and “abysses” are to be brought into submission to the people of God. This “everlasting dominion” of God’s people, involving all the nations of the earth, is to be sustained by God himself, directly, without human military force. 4Q246, with its thrice-repeated emphasis on peace as an essential feature of the reign of God’s people over the nations, stands in stark contrast to 1QM — in even greater contrast than does Daniel 7.

⁽⁶⁰⁾ DAVIDSON, *Angels*, 227.

But the distinction between the eschatologies of 4Q246 and 1QM has deeper roots. Their contrasting eschatologies embody fundamentally different cosmologies — that is, different conceptions of the nature and structure of creation. In 4Q246, as in Daniel 7, the domination by the evil powers appears as a temporary distortion of the order of the universe. There is no suggestion that the chaos that ensues is inherent in the order of creation itself. The chaos is only a rebellion after which the true order of nature will be restored⁽⁶¹⁾. Thus the eschatological crisis involves a basically good creation overwhelmed by the chaos unleashed by evil powers that have temporarily subjugated the earth. God acts directly to subdue the evil powers, to bring order out of the chaos, and to transform creation, including all of the nations, into its true nature and structure. In essence, therefore, the cosmology of 4Q246 is not dualistic. The defining characteristic of cosmological dualism lies not so much in the opposition of evil and good in the cosmos as in their classification as primary and *irreducible* cosmological divisions⁽⁶²⁾.

1QM, by contrast, embodies a perfectly balanced cosmological dualism between Belial and Michael prior to God's intervention, which implies that evil is embedded in the very constitution of creation. While in 4Q246 evil and chaos temporarily *dominate* the cosmos, in 1QM evil is *commensurate* with a distinct part of the cosmos itself. In 1QM, evil forces do not dominate but are rather engaged in a perfectly balanced power struggle with the forces of good. In effect, God finally intervenes to solve the problem of evil by tipping the scale of power so that the "sons of light" can now eradicate the "sons of darkness". Evil is purged from creation via the utter extermination of all creatures, heavenly and earthly, "of the lot of Belial". God does not act directly to accomplish this. The community or the "sons of light", as the inscriptions on the trumpets and banners of 1QM 2,16-5,2 explicitly state, act as God's instruments of annihilation.

It is a fascinating phenomenon that a fragment espousing an eschatological vision so much at odds with the dualistic world-view of the Qumran covenanters should be found preserved in their library. However, it should be recalled that there is only a single

⁽⁶¹⁾ COLLINS, "Mythology", 608.

⁽⁶²⁾ DUHAIME, "Le dualisme", 401-402.

extant copy of this fragment. As Carol A. Newsom has shown, most of the nonbiblical texts that exist in two or more copies and the great majority of those found in more than one of the caves are either products of the Qumran community or are closely related to central aspects of its theology and praxis. Of course, 1QM, 1QS, CD, and 1QH — all of which reflect a dualistic perspective — exist in multiple copies and in more than one cave. 4Q^cAmram, a text articulating a light/darkness dualism close to that found in 1QM and 1QS, exists in multiple (5) copies in cave 4⁽⁶³⁾. 4Q246, however, is not among the documents most highly favoured at Qumran. The closeness of the fragment to Daniel 7 may account for its presence, given that eight copies of Daniel have been found at Qumran. Perhaps the covenanters, who seem to have taken no notice of how much the perspective of Daniel is at odds with their own, also did not note the profound contrast this little text presents to their world-view. Clearly, whoever authored the lines of 4Q246 envisaged the world in a radically different light.

Department of Religious Studies
McMaster University
1280 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario
Canada L8S 4L8

Sharon Lea MATTILA

SOMMAIRE

Le scénario eschatologique de 4Q246, qui combine des thèmes de Dn 7 avec les oracles de salut bibliques, contraste de façon frappante avec l'eschatologie de 1QM. Il est très improbable que ces œuvres aient été composées toutes les deux à Qumrân. 4Q246 fait allusion au mythe cananéen du conflit avec les forces du chaos, comme Dn 7. Dieu agit directement pour transformer le chaos en monde organisé, pour soumettre les nations à la domination pacifique et éternelle du peuple de Dieu. Par contre, 1QM se caractérise par un profond dualisme cosmologique; dans ce cadre, le but explicite des « fils de la lumière » est d'anéantir complètement les « fils des ténèbres ».

⁽⁶³⁾ “‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature from Qumran”, *The Hebrew Bible and its Interpreters* (ed. W. H. PROPP–B. HALPERN–D. N. FREEDMAN) (Winona Lake, IN 1990) 169–171.

ANIMADVERSIONES

**“...denn wie der Mensch jedes Tier nennt, so soll es heißen”
(Gen 2,19)**

Zur Bezeichnung von Rindern im Alten Testament

Es gibt im Hebräischen eine ganze Reihe von Begriffen, die sich auf Rinder beziehen: *’abîr*, *’elep*, *bāqār*, *’ēgel*, *’eglâ*, *par*, *pārâ*, *r^e’ēm* und *šôr*. Ein Problem ist, daß sich diese Begriffe zum Teil nur schwer voneinander abgrenzen lassen. Das liegt daran, daß man kein einheitliches Unterscheidungskriterium finden kann, sondern von mehreren ausgehen muß, die sich überlappen können.

Ein erstes Kriterium ist die Rinderart: Haben wir es mit einem Wildrind, einem Hausrind oder einem Büffel zu tun, und läßt sich das auf Siegeln häufig dargestellte Buckelrind auch terminologisch fassen? Ein zweites Kriterium ist das Alter der Tiere. Bei *par* und *pārâ* stellt sich die Frage, ob speziell Jungtiere gemeint sind, und bei *šôr*, ob der Begriff nur ausgewachsene Rinder meint oder Tiere jeden Alters. Ein drittes Kriterium ist das Geschlecht. Hier stellt sich die Frage, ob *šôr* nur einen Stier bezeichnet oder auch weibliche Tiere. Die Kastration von Stieren läßt sich für Israel nicht belegen, ja sie ist nach Lev 22,24b verboten⁽¹⁾, und ein

⁽¹⁾ Vgl. Josephus, *Ant.* IV 8,40. Für die Kastration von Stieren im spätbronzezeitlichen Palästina führt P. THOMSEN, “Rind”, *RLV* XI 142f; die Beutelisten Thutmosis III. an, da in ihnen zwischen Stieren und Ochsen differenziert werde. Tatsächlich gebraucht die von Thomsen zitierte englische Textausgabe (J. H. BREASTED, *Ancient Records of Egypt* II § 447; 471; 482; 491) den Terminus ‘ox’ jedoch — wie in der alttestamentlichen und ägyptologischen Literatur leider häufig — nicht in einem strengen Sinne, d.h. sie meint damit nicht einen kastrierten Stier, sondern ganz allgemein ein Rind. So kann sie sowohl *’w3* als auch *wndw* mit ‘ox’ übersetzen (zum Wortgebrauch s. F. W. BISSING, *Die statistischen Tafeln von Karnak* [Leipzig 1897] Z. 2.11.15f.22f.27f.31.33.36). Zwar sind die beiden Begriffe in den besagten Listen anders als *k3* ‘Stier’ nicht mit einem erigierten Penis als Determinativ versehen, jedoch besagt dies noch nicht, daß wir es mit Ochsen zu tun haben. *’w3* ist vielmehr “ein allgemeiner und verbreiteter Begriff für Rinder” (W. GHONEIN, *Die ökonomische Bedeutung des Rindes im Alten Ägypten* [Bonn 1977] 70), und mit *wndw* ist nach A. ERMAN – H. GRAPOW, *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache* (Leipzig – Berlin 1926–1963) ein kurzhörniges Rind gemeint (vgl. *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*, “Rind”, 258; GHONEIN, *Bedeutung*, 79f; dagegen BISSING, *Tafeln*, 43). — Die landwirtschaftliche Verwendung nicht-kastrierter Stiere (z.B. als Zugtiere) ist heute hierzulande nur noch schwer vorstellbar, war zu Anfang unseres Jahrhunderts aber durchaus noch üblich, ja wird in damaliger Standardliteratur sogar als nützlich für die Tiere empfohlen (G. KRAFFT, *Lehrbuch der Landwirtschaft auf wissenschaftlicher und praktischer Grundlage*, Bd. III Tierzuchtlehre [Berlin ¹⁰1918] 199f.) und ist für Palästina von G. DALMAN, *Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina* II (Gütersloh 1932) 159f. bezeugt.

Terminus für Ochsen fehlt im Hebräischen⁽²⁾. Deswegen ist der Gebrauch dieses Begriffs in deutschen Bibelübersetzungen irreführend.

Neben den damit angesprochenen Unterscheidungskategorien ist m.E. ein Kriterium einzuführen, das bislang nicht berücksichtigt wurde, nämlich das der Funktion. Ein Rind wird — so unsere These — anders bezeichnet, je nachdem in welcher Funktion, unter welchem Aspekt bzw. in welchem situativen Kontext von ihm die Rede ist. So können für ein und dasselbe Tier je nach dessen Funktion unterschiedliche Begriffe verwendet werden.

Unter Berücksichtigung der verschiedenen Kriterien ergibt sich für die Abgrenzung der oben genannten Rinderbegriffe folgendes Bild:

1. *rē'ēm* Wildrind⁽³⁾

Das auffallendste Merkmal des Wildrinds sind seine Hörner. Von diesen ist an über 50 % aller alttestamentlichen Belegstellen die Rede. Das Wildrind gilt als Inbegriff von Kraft und Stärke, ja von Souveränität und Freiheit. Es kann in Bildreden neben dem Löwen stehen, um feindliche Mächte zu veranschaulichen (Ps 22,22), es kann aber auch einer helfenden Macht oder der eigenen Stärke Ausdruck verleihen (Num 23,22; 24,8; Dtn 33,17; Ps 92,11). Eine ausführliche Charakterisierung bietet Ijob 39,9f. Danach ist das Wildrind von stolzer Souveränität erfüllt. Der Mensch hat ihm gegenüber keine Macht. Er kann es nicht fangen und für seine Interessen einspannen.

2. *bāqār* Hausrind

Dem Wildrind steht das Hausrind gegenüber. Wie bei *rē'ēm*, aber auch bei *šō'n* 'Kleinvieh' und *'ādām* 'Mensch', handelt es sich bei *bāqār* um einen Gattungsbegriff, der eine Fülle von Aspekten umschließt. Er kann in sehr verschiedenen Kontexten gebraucht werden: das Rind als Herdentier und Besitz, als Schlachttier, besonders für festliche Mahlzeiten, oder auch als Opfertier, und zwar sowohl bei Sünd- und Brandopfern (nur männliche Tiere) als auch bei Schlachtopfern (auch weibliche Tiere; Lev 3,1)⁽⁴⁾. Ein spezieller Aspekt ist nicht erkennbar. Wir haben es mit einem häufig kollektiv gebrauchten Oberbegriff zu tun, und die folgenden Rinderbegriffe grenzen alle einen speziellen Aspekt dieses Oberbegriffs ab.

a. *Junge Rinder*

'ēgel und *'eglā* beziehen sich auf eine bestimmte Altersgruppe. Gemeint sind nicht unbedingt kleine Kälber, sondern *Jungstier* und *Jungkuh*. Eine *'eglā* kann nach Gen 15,9 drei Jahre alt sein, also durchaus schon ein großes und zu landwirtschaftlicher Arbeit fähiges Tier; sie gilt als geschlechtsreif, kann sogar Milch geben und somit schon gekalbt haben

⁽²⁾ Vgl. die umständliche Umschreibung in Lev 22,24.

⁽³⁾ Es handelt sich hier nicht — wie von LXX μονόκερως; Vulgata *rinoceros* bzw. *unicornis* nahegelegt — um ein Einhorn oder Nashorn.

⁽⁴⁾ Vgl. B. BECK, "*bāqār*", *TWAT* I, 736-743.

(Ri 14,18; Jes 7,21f; Hos 10,11)⁽⁵⁾. Den männlichen *‘ēgel* wird man sich ähnlich ausgewachsen vorstellen dürfen. Diese Jungtiere begegnen in unterschiedlichen Kontexten: Der Verzehr von Mastkälbern — hier sind wohl ganz junge Tiere gemeint — gilt als Delikatesse (Am 6,4; vgl. 1 Sam 28,24)⁽⁶⁾. Männliche und weibliche Jungrinder können Jahwe geopfert werden, und zwar als Schlachtopfer (1 Sam 16,2) ebenso wie als Brand- bzw. Sündopfer (Lev 9,2.3.8; Mich 6,6). Jungrinder gelten einerseits als unerfahren (Jer 31,18), andererseits aber auch als besonders stark und lebhaft, ja als von jugendlicher Kraft und Vitalität erfüllt (Jer 46,21; 50,11; Mal 3,20; Ps 29,6; 68,31).

b. Ausgewachsene Rinder

pārā meint eine *Kuh* als Einzeltier, und zwar vor allem in landwirtschaftlichem Kontext. Häufig hält man *par* und *pārā* für Jungtiere⁽⁷⁾. Den alttestamentlichen Texten ist dies jedoch nicht zu entnehmen, ja nach Ri 6,25 kann ein *par* bereits sieben Jahre alt sein⁽⁸⁾, und eine *pārā* tritt in Ijob 21,10 als Muttertier auf. Die *pārā* dürfte also eine ausgewachsene Kuh sein. Sie erscheint vor allem als Tier einer Herde (Gen 32,16) oder als Zugtier (1 Sam 6,7ff), das störrisch sein kann (Hos 4,16). In rituellem Kontext findet sich eine Kuh nur in Num 19,1-10⁽⁹⁾. Auch wenn sie dort als *ḥaṭṭāʾt* bezeichnet wird, ist festzuhalten, daß sich die *pārā* anders als die Jungkuh (*‘eglā*; vgl. *šōr nēqēbā* Lev 3,1) nicht als normales Opfertier belegen läßt.

⁽⁵⁾ Wenn Dtn 21,3 zudem von einer *‘eglā* spricht, die noch kein Joch getragen hat, so zeigt dies, daß eine *‘eglā* nicht per definitionem noch unter keinem Joch war. In Num 19,2 spricht ein vergleichbarer Ritualtext von einer *pārā* ‘Kuh’, die noch kein Joch getragen hat. Das deutet darauf, daß der Unterschied zwischen *‘eglā* und *pārā* fließend ist.

⁽⁶⁾ Vgl. H. WEIPPERT, “Amos. Seine Bilder und ihr Milieu”, *Beiträge zur prophetischen Bildsprache in Israel und Assyrien* (ed. H. WEIPPERT u.a.) (OBO 64; Freiburg/Schweiz – Göttingen 1985) 1-29, 7-10.

⁽⁷⁾ Für die Jungtierhypothese läßt sich folgendes anführen: 1) die häufig belegte Wendung *par bēn bāqār*, die in *‘ēgel bēn bāqār* bzw. *‘eglat bāqār* (Lev 9,2; Dtn 21,3; 1 Sam 16,2; Jes 7,21) eine Parallele hat; 2) in späterem Hebräisch und einigen anderen semitischen Sprachen bezeichnen wurzelverwandte Worte Jungtiere (wenn auch nicht immer von Rindern; vgl. HALAT; K.-M. BEYSE, “*par*”, *TWAT* VI, 725-731, 726); 3) die LXX gibt *par* in aller Regel mit *μόσχος* ‘Jungstier’ und *pārā* mit *δάμαλις* ‘Jungkuh’ wieder; allerdings übersetzt die LXX auch *šōr* meist mit *μόσχος*. Vertreten wird die Übersetzung ‘Jungstier/Jungkuh’ von W. GESENIUS – F. BUHL, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament* (Berlin 171915); F. BROWN – S. R. DRIVER – C. A. BRIGGS, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford 1906); H.-J. ZOBEL, “*šōr*”, *TWAT* VIII. KB² bezeichnet nur den *par* als jungen Stier (vgl. BECK, “*bāqār*”, 742), die *pārā* dagegen als Kuh ohne Altersspezifikation. Ausgewachsene Tiere sind gemeint nach HALAT und R. PÉTER, “*pr* et *šwr*. Note de lexicographie hébraïque”, *VT* 25 (1975) 486-496, 489-492; R. PÉTER-CONTESSÉ, “Note on the Semantic Domains of Two Hebrew Words: *pr* and *šwr*”, *BT* 27 (1976) 119-121; DERS., “Quels animaux Israël offrait-il en sacrifice?”, *Studien zu Opfer und Kult im Alten Testament* (ed. A. SCHENKER) (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 3; Tübingen 1992) 67-77, 68.

⁽⁸⁾ Zum Text vgl. Anm. 23.

⁽⁹⁾ Zum Ritual vgl. A. I. BAUMGARTEN, “The Paradox of the Red Heifer”, *VT* 43 (1993) 442-451.

Für ausgewachsene männliche Rinder gibt es mehrere Begriffe:

¹⁰*abîr* kommt, was das Assoziationsfeld angeht, dem *re'ēm* 'Wildstier' nahe⁽¹⁰⁾, denn hier ist ein Stier als starkes, kämpferisches Tier gemeint, kurz: ein *Bulle*. Das Wort als solches bedeutet zunächst 'stark, kräftig'⁽¹¹⁾. Von dieser Grundbedeutung ausgehend, kann dann ein Tier unter dem Aspekt der Kraft und Stärke bezeichnet werden, und zwar ein Hengst ebenso wie ein Stier. Auf Menschen bezogen können politische und militärische Machthaber gemeint sein. Dabei bleibt allerdings unklar, ob sich diese Bedeutung direkt von der Grundbedeutung ableitet oder die Tierbezeichnung metaphorisch gebraucht wird. Für die zweite Möglichkeit sprechen der Vergleich in Jes 10,13: "Wie ein Stier (*ke'abîr*, Ketib) stoße ich (sc. der assyrische König) die Bewohner nieder" und der Gebrauch von *abîr* in Ps 68,31, der ausweislich der Verwendung des parallelen *ēgel* als metaphorischer zu bezeichnen ist. Im Deutschen kommt dem hebräischen Begriff angesichts des biologischen Bedeutungsspektrums und der metaphorischen Verwendung das Wort 'Bulle' relativ nahe.

Ps 50,13 weicht von dem damit umrissenen Gebrauch von *abîr* ab. Hier ist von einem Stier nicht unter dem Aspekt 'Kampfesstärke', sondern als Opfertier die Rede. Jahwe stellt die rhetorische Frage: "Soll ich Fleisch von Bullen essen und Blut von Böcken trinken?" Doch dieser abweichende Gebrauch läßt sich erklären: Wie *dm* 'twdm 'Blut von Böcken' bildet nämlich auch *bśr* 'byrym 'Fleisch von Bullen' ein Wortspiel. Dieses dürfte die ungewöhnliche Wortwahl veranlaßt haben⁽¹²⁾.

Auch *par* bezeichnet einen Stier, jedoch in ganz anderem Zusammenhang. Hier haben wir es mit dem *Opferstier* zu tun, d.h. dem Stier als Opfertier. Von den über 130 Belegstellen geht es in mehr als 95 % aller Fälle um Opfer, und zwar fast immer um Brandopfer (ca. 50 %) und Sündopfer (ca. 38 %), also um Opfer, bei denen zumindest ein Großteil des Tieres letztendlich verbrannt wird.

An sechs Stellen ist auf den ersten Blick nicht von Opfern die Rede. Es stellt sich die Frage, warum an diesen Stellen *par* gebraucht wird.

1) In Hos 14,3 ist *perîm* mit LXX von *perî* abzuleiten bzw. der Text entsprechend zu ändern: "Wir bringen die Frucht unserer Lippen dar".

2) Jes 34,7; Jer 50,27 und Ez 39,18 sprechen von Stieren jeweils im Kontext von Kampfschilderungen. Edom, Babylon und Magog wird ein furchtbares Blutbad angekündigt. Jes 34 nimmt bei der Beschreibung des Gemetzels von Bosra kultische Terminologie auf. Da ist vom Blut und Fett der Lämmer und Böcke die Rede, vor allem aber vom *zebah le'yhwh*, was normalerweise 'Schlachtopfer für Jahwe' heißt⁽¹³⁾, hier aber im Sinne von 'Schlachten durch Jahwe' zu verstehen ist (vgl. Jer 46,10). Auch Ez 39 be-

⁽¹⁰⁾ Vgl. Jes 34,7.

⁽¹¹⁾ Vgl. akkadisch *abāru(m)*, 'Kraft, Stärke' (s. CAD, anders AHw).

⁽¹²⁾ *bśr šôr* hätte auch ein Wortspiel ergeben, der exakte synonyme Parallelismus hätte darunter jedoch gelitten, da *šôr* keinen Plural bildet.

⁽¹³⁾ Vgl. Gen 46,1; Ex 18,12; 24,5; Lev 17,5; Num 6,17; 1 Sam 1,21; Jon 1,16; 1 Chr 29,21.

schreibt das angekündigte blutige Geschehen als *zebah* (V. 17.19), als ein Opfermahl, bei dem die wilden Tiere das Fleisch und Blut von Fürsten sowie von Widdern, Lämmern, Böcken und Stieren verzehren werden. Die Opferterminologie wird in beiden Fällen herangezogen, um den blutigen Charakter des Geschehens drastisch vor Augen zu führen. Im Kontext von Jer 50,27 fehlt eine solche Opferterminologie zwar, jedoch geht es auch hier darum, daß Stiere getötet werden. Alle drei Texte gebrauchen den Begriff *par* 'Opferstier', weil sie von Stieren sprechen, die geschlachtet, ja dahingemetzelt werden sollen. Vorstellungen von Blut und Tod, die bei *par* mitschwingen, dürften für die Wortwahl den Ausschlag gegeben haben.

3) In Gen 32,16 — und nur dort — steht *par* im Kontext einer Liste von Herdentieren: Ziegen und Böcke, Schafe und Widder, Kamele, Kühe und Stiere, Esel und Eselinnen. Der Gebrauch von *par* mag hier vom Parallelbegriff *pārâ* beeinflusst sein. Vielleicht hängt er auch damit zusammen, daß die Herde zusammengestellt wird, um sie Esau als *minhâ* 'Gabe' zu schenken. In diesem Fall könnte der Opfergedanke eine Rolle spielen, wenn auch ein ganz anderer Aspekt hervorträte als bei den eben besprochenen Kampfes schilderungen.

4) Ps 22,13 lautet: "Viele Stiere umringen mich, Bullen von Basan kesseln mich ein". Dieser Gebrauch von *par* hebt sich deutlich von den übrigen Stellen ab.

Trotz Ps 22,13 (und Gen 32,16) ist festzuhalten: *par* bildet im biblischen Hebräisch nicht das männliche Pendant zu *pārâ* 'Kuh'. Auffällig ist schon, daß die beiden Wörter außer in Gen 32,16 nie zusammengestellt werden⁽¹⁴⁾. *par* meint vielmehr einen Stier unter einem ganz bestimmten Aspekt bzw. in einer bestimmten Funktion. Es ist ein Stier, der als Opfer dargebracht und getötet wird.

c. Rinder unabhängig von Alter und Geschlecht

šôr bezeichnet das *Gutsrind*, d.h. das Rind als Nutztier und Wirtschaftsgut, und zwar unabhängig von Alter⁽¹⁵⁾ und Geschlecht⁽¹⁶⁾. Der Aspekt 'Nutztier' läßt sich in verschiedene Teilaspekte aufschlüsseln:

1) Als Nutztier ist das Rind zunächst ein wertvoller Besitzgegenstand. *šôr* begegnet folglich bei Besitz- und Verlustangaben (z.B. Gen 32,6). Anders als bei *par*⁽¹⁷⁾ — und dieser Unterschied ist bedeutsam — finden sich

⁽¹⁴⁾ In Ijob 21,10 bildet *šôr* das maskuline Pendant zu *pārâ*.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Nach KB² meint *šôr* nur ausgewachsene Tiere. Da in Lev 22,27 jedoch ein kleines Kälbchen gemeint ist, dürfte der Begriff kein bestimmtes Alter implizieren; vgl. GESENIUS – BUHL, *Handwörterbuch*; PÉTER, "pr et šwr", 492-496; PÉTER-CONTESSE, "Note", 120f.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Nach KB² sind nur männliche Tiere gemeint. Da die Rechtstexte jedoch kaum nur Stiere betreffen, dürfte *šôr* geschlechtsunspezifisch zu verstehen sein; vgl. GESENIUS – BUHL, *Handwörterbuch*; HALAT; BDB, *Lexicon*; PÉTER, "pr et šwr", 492-496; PÉTER-CONTESSE, "Note", 120f; ZOBEL, "šôr", *TWAT* VIII.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Das über 130mal belegte Nomen trägt außer in Jer 50,27 nie ein Suffix und findet sich auch nie in einer Konstruktverbindung, in der das nomen rectum einen Besitzer angibt.

bei *šôr* possessive Näherbestimmungen. So soll man das Rind seines Nächsten nicht begehren⁽¹⁸⁾ und dem Rind seines Feindes helfen (Ex 23,4)⁽¹⁹⁾. In Rechtstexten wird *šôr* beispielsweise gebraucht, um Rinderdiebstahl (22,3) zu thematisieren sowie die Verantwortung des Rinderhalters für Schäden, die sein Tier verursacht (Ex 21f; Dtn, 22,1ff). Kultische Texte sprechen von *šôr*, wo es um die Übereignung der Erstgeburt an Jahwe⁽²⁰⁾ oder um andere Formen des Gebens geht⁽²¹⁾. In Kriegserzählungen ist mehrfach von der Vernichtung des Rinderbesitzes, und damit des ökonomischen Lebensnervs eines Volkes, die Rede⁽²²⁾.

Der Unterschied gegenüber *par* 'Opferrind' wird in Ri 6,25 deutlich: Gideon soll sich für ein Brandopfer den Stier (*par*) der Rinder (*šôr*) nehmen, die seinem Vater gehören⁽²³⁾. Der Sinn der häufig für pleonastisch und umständlich gehaltenen Formulierung *par haššôr* wird deutlich, wenn man sieht, daß hier zwei Aspekte zusammentreffen, die für je einen der beiden Rinderbegriffe typisch sind: *par* bezieht sich auf den Stier als Opfertier, *šôr* auf eben dieses Tier, jedoch unter dem Gesichtspunkt, daß es Eigentum des Vaters ist⁽²⁴⁾.

Die Abgrenzung zwischen *šôr* und *bāqār* wird in Num 7,3 deutlich: "Und sie (sc. die zwölf Fürsten Israels) brachten als ihre Weihgabe vor Jahwe sechs überdachte Wagen und zwölf Rinder (*bāqār*), ein Wagen auf zwei Fürsten und ein Rind (*šôr*) auf einen". Zunächst ist von den Rindern als Zugtieren die Rede, und dabei wird der Gattungsbegriff gebraucht. Dann geht es um die Stiftung und das, was jeder Fürst beizusteuern hat, und in diesem Zusammenhang werden dieselben Tiere *šôr* genannt. Jetzt ist von ihnen unter dem Aspekt des Besitzes bzw. der Übereignung die Rede.

2) Als Nutztier und wertvoller Besitz muß ein Rind angemessen gehalten werden. Hier kommt das Rind als Weidetier in den Blick. Man muß ihm Nahrung geben, Ruhezeiten gönnen und es aus Notlagen befreien⁽²⁵⁾.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Ex 20,17; Dtn 5,21; vgl. 1 Sam 12,3.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Vgl. Ex 21,35; Jos 7,24; Jes 1,3; Ijob 24,3.

⁽²⁰⁾ Ex 22,29; 34,19; Lev 27,26; Num 18,17; Dtn 15,19.

⁽²¹⁾ *nēdābā*; *neder* Lev 22,23; *qorbān* Lev 22,27; Num 7,3.

⁽²²⁾ Jos 6,21; Ri 6,4; 1 Sam 15,3; 22,19.

⁽²³⁾ Die viel diskutierte Frage, ob Gideon zwei Stiere oder nur einen nehmen soll, kann hier außer acht bleiben. Zu den Textproblemen des Verses vgl. L. SCHMIDT, *Menschlicher Erfolg und Jahwes Initiative* (WMANT 38; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1970) 6f.; J. A. EMERTON, "The 'Second Bull' in Judges 6,25-28", *Eretz-Israel* 14 (1978) 52*-55*; A. SOGGIN, *Judges* (OTL; Philadelphia 1981) 123f.; U. BECKER, *Richterzeit und Königtum* (BZAW 192; Berlin – New York 1990) 154f.; C. FREVEL, *Aschera und der Ausschließlichkeitsanspruch YHWHs* (Diss. Bonn 1994) 129-132.

⁽²⁴⁾ *par haššôr* ist also gegen L. SCHMIDT, *Erfolg*, 6, n. 3; vgl. PÉTER, "pr et šur", 490, etwas anderes als das geläufige *par bēn bāqār*.

⁽²⁵⁾ Vgl. Ex 23,12; Num 22,4; Dtn 5,14; 22,1.4; 25,4; Jes 7,25; 32,20; Ps 106,20; Ijob 6,5.

3) Der Nutzen des Rindes liegt zum einen in seiner Arbeit. Es zieht den Pflug und mehrt so den landwirtschaftlichen Ertrag⁽²⁶⁾. Zum anderen dient das Rind der fleischlichen Nahrung. Rinder wurden profan geschlachtet, um sie zu verzehren⁽²⁷⁾. So gehörte nach Neh 5,18 ein Rind zu den täglichen Rationen, die Nehemia dem Volk zukommen ließ. Speisevorschriften regeln, was man von einem Rind essen darf und was nicht (Lev 7,23; Dtn 14,4). Als Opfertier wird der *šôr* nur für Gemeinschafts- und Schlachtopfer gebraucht, also für die Opferarten, bei denen das Fleisch des Tieres von den Kultteilnehmern in einem Gemeinschaftsmahl verzehrt wird⁽²⁸⁾. Der *šôr* kann somit auch in kultischem Kontext in gewisser Weise als Nutztier bezeichnet werden. Er unterscheidet sich vom *par*, denn dieser Begriff meint in aller Regel ein Rind im Zusammenhang von Brand- oder Sündopfer, also ein Rind, dessen Fleisch auf die eine oder andere Weise verbrannt wird⁽²⁹⁾. Eine Überlappung im Bedeutungsspektrum gibt es zwischen *šôr* und *par* nur insofern, als sich auch *par* in einigen — jedoch wenigen — Fällen auf Schlacht- oder Ganzopfer beziehen kann.

ʿelep (vgl. *ʿallûp*) ist vielleicht von *ʿlp* ‘mit etwas vertraut sein’ abzuleiten. Das Wort bezeichnet das *Hofrind*, d.h. das Rind in landwirtschaftlichem Kontext. Der Begriff begegnet nur im Zusammenhang ‘Ackerbau und Viehzucht’⁽³⁰⁾, er fehlt dagegen in kultischen und juristischen Texten. Bei *ʿelep* kommt somit ein Aspekt zum Tragen, der sich auch bei *šôr* findet. *ʿelep* ist der engere, *šôr* der weitere Begriff. An allen *ʿelep*-Stellen könnte vermutlich *šôr* stehen, das Umgekehrte wird man jedoch nicht sagen können. Keine Überlappung im Bedeutungsspektrum ergibt sich dagegen zwischen *ʿelep* und *par*.

*

* *

Zusammenfassend läßt sich sagen: Zur Unterscheidung der verschiedenen hebräischen Rinderbegriffe ist neben dem Kriterium der Rinderart (*reʿēm* ‘Wildrind’ – *bāqār* ‘Hausrind’), des Alters (*ʿēgel* ‘Jungstier’, *ʿeglā* ‘Jungkuh’) und des Geschlechts (*pārā* ‘Kuh’), das der Funktion einzuführen. Je nachdem in welchem Kontext von einem Stier bzw. Rind die Rede

⁽²⁶⁾ Vgl. Dtn 15,19; 22,10; Spr 14,4; Ijob 21,10.

⁽²⁷⁾ Mit *ḫḫ* Ex 21,37; Dtn 28,31; vgl. Spr 7,22; mit *šḫṭ* 1 Sam 14,34. Vgl. Spr 15,17.

⁽²⁸⁾ *šēlāmîm*: Lev 4,10; 9,4.18f; vgl. Lev 17,3ff. *zebah/zbḫ* Dtn 17,1; 18,3; 2 Sam 6,13; 1 Kön 1,19.25; Hos 12,12. Mit *šḫṭ*, ohne daß explizit gesagt würde, welche Opferart gemeint ist: Lev 22,28; Jes 66,3. Nur in Num 15,11 (vgl. Lev 22,27 *ʾiššeh*) ist von *šôr* in einem Kontext die Rede, der neben Schlacht- und Gemeinschaftsopfern auch Brandopfer nennt. In Ps 69,32 dürften mit *par* und *šôr* unterschiedliche Opferarten angesprochen sein, um das ganze Opferwesen kritisch zu hinterfragen.

⁽²⁹⁾ In Gen 49,6; Dtn 33,17 (zum Text vgl. K. KOENEN, “‘Süßes geht vom Starken aus’ [Ri 14,14]. Tiere als Vergleichspender für Jahwe”, *EvT* 55 [1995]) wird *šôr* metaphorisch gebraucht, um die Stärke von Menschen zu veranschaulichen. Dieser Gebrauch von *šôr* entspricht dem von *ʾabîr*.

⁽³⁰⁾ Dtn 7,13; 28,4.18.51; Jes 30,24; Ps 144,4; Spr 14,4; Sir 38,25.

ist, wird ein anderer Begriff gebraucht: *ʿabîr* meint einen Stier als kraftvolles Tier ('Bulle'), *par* einen Stier als Brand- oder Sündopfer ('Opferstier'), *šôr* ein Rind als Wirtschaftsgut ('Gutsrind') und *ʿelep* ein Rind im Kontext von Ackerbau und Viehzucht ('Hofrind').

Evang.-Theol. Stift der
Universität Bonn
Humboldtstr. 42
D-53115 Bonn

Klaus KOENEN

Gewollt dunkle Wiedergaben in LXX?

Am Beispiel von Ps 28 (29),6

1. Das Problem der dunklen Stellen im LXX-Psalter

In den LXX der Psalmen kommt eine Reihe von dunklen Stellen vor, die im Griechischen kaum einen verständlichen Sinn ergeben. Beispiele sind Ps 15(16),4; 28(29),6; 57(58),9-10; 67(68),13-14; 140(141),6-7, u.a. Wie müssen wir diese Wiedergaben erklären? Erklären sie sich aus dem Unvermögen von Übersetzern, die ihre Vorlage nicht verstanden und sich mit einer behelfsmässigen Wiedergabe, mit einer sog. "Verlegenheitsübersetzung" begnügten?

Die Übersetzungsfehler und die mangelhaften Sprachkenntnisse der LXX-Übersetzer wurden schon früher und auch jüngst wieder zur Erklärung bestimmter Eigentümlichkeiten der LXX-Übersetzung untersucht⁽¹⁾.

(1) E. Tov, "Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand their Hebrew Text?", *De Septuaginta*. Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on His sixty-fifth Birthday (ed. A. PIETERSMA – C. COX) (Mississauga, Ont. 1984) 53-70; M. FLASHAR, "Exegetische Studien zum Septuagintapsalter", *ZAW* 32 (1912) 81-116; 161-189; 241-268. Zur Übersetzungstechnik der LXX allgemein siehe: S. OLOFSSON, *The LXX Version. A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint* (ConB.OT 30; Stockholm 1990); id., *God is My Rock. A Study of Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis in the Septuagint* (ConB.OT 31; Stockholm 1990); J. N. SAILHAMER, *The Translation Technique of the Greek Septuagint for the Hebrew Verbs and Participles in Psalms 3-41* (Studies in Biblical Greek 2; New York 1991); M. HARL, "Les divergences entre la Septante et le texte massorétique", *La Bible grecque des Septante*. Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien (éd. M. HARL – G. DORIVAL – O. MUNNICH) (Initiations au christianisme ancien; Paris 1988) 201-222; M. HARL, "La 'Bible d'Alexandrie' et les études sur la Septante. Réflexions sur une première expérience", *Vigiliae Christianae* 47 (1993) 313-340; B. BOTTE – P.-M. BOGAERT, "La Septante", *DBS* XII, fasc. 68 (Paris 1993) 536-691, hier bes. Sp. 555-559.

ist, wird ein anderer Begriff gebraucht: *ʿabîr* meint einen Stier als kraftvolles Tier ('Bulle'), *par* einen Stier als Brand- oder Sündopfer ('Opferstier'), *šôr* ein Rind als Wirtschaftsgut ('Gutsrind') und *ʿelep* ein Rind im Kontext von Ackerbau und Viehzucht ('Hofrind').

Evang.-Theol. Stift der
Universität Bonn
Humboldtstr. 42
D-53115 Bonn

Klaus KOENEN

Gewollt dunkle Wiedergaben in LXX?

Am Beispiel von Ps 28 (29),6

1. Das Problem der dunklen Stellen im LXX-Psalter

In den LXX der Psalmen kommt eine Reihe von dunklen Stellen vor, die im Griechischen kaum einen verständlichen Sinn ergeben. Beispiele sind Ps 15(16),4; 28(29),6; 57(58),9-10; 67(68),13-14; 140(141),6-7, u.a. Wie müssen wir diese Wiedergaben erklären? Erklären sie sich aus dem Unvermögen von Übersetzern, die ihre Vorlage nicht verstanden und sich mit einer behelfsmässigen Wiedergabe, mit einer sog. "Verlegenheitsübersetzung" begnügten?

Die Übersetzungsfehler und die mangelhaften Sprachkenntnisse der LXX-Übersetzer wurden schon früher und auch jüngst wieder zur Erklärung bestimmter Eigentümlichkeiten der LXX-Übersetzung untersucht⁽¹⁾.

(1) E. Tov, "Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand their Hebrew Text?", *De Septuaginta*. Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on His sixty-fifth Birthday (ed. A. PIETERSMA – C. COX) (Mississauga, Ont. 1984) 53-70; M. FLASHAR, "Exegetische Studien zum Septuagintapsalter", *ZAW* 32 (1912) 81-116; 161-189; 241-268. Zur Übersetzungstechnik der LXX allgemein siehe: S. OLOFSSON, *The LXX Version. A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint* (ConB.OT 30; Stockholm 1990); id., *God is My Rock. A Study of Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis in the Septuagint* (ConB.OT 31; Stockholm 1990); J. N. SAILHAMER, *The Translation Technique of the Greek Septuagint for the Hebrew Verbs and Participles in Psalms 3-41* (Studies in Biblical Greek 2; New York 1991); M. HARL, "Les divergences entre la Septante et le texte massorétique", *La Bible grecque des Septante*. Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien (éd. M. HARL – G. DORIVAL – O. MUNNICH) (Initiations au christianisme ancien; Paris 1988) 201-222; M. HARL, "La 'Bible d'Alexandrie' et les études sur la Septante. Réflexions sur une première expérience", *Vigiliae Christianae* 47 (1993) 313-340; B. BOTTE – P.-M. BOGAERT, "La Septante", *DBS* XII, fasc. 68 (Paris 1993) 536-691, hier bes. Sp. 555-559.

Genügt es jedoch, von Fehlern zu reden, um diese ziemlich zahlreichen Stellen im Psalter zu erklären? Oder liegt hier eine andere Auffassung des Übersetzens vor, derzufolge eine Übersetzung gar nicht klar und verständlich zu sein hat, wenn ihre Vorlage selbst dunkel ist? Könnte es nicht sein, dass diese Übersetzer der LXX der Meinung waren, eine dunkle Vorlage in den Psalmen müsse auch in der Wiedergabe dunkel sein, weil die Vorlage selbst aus bestimmten Gründen dunkel war, so dass es dem Übersetzer gar nicht erlaubt war, durch auslegende Interpretationen oder gar Emendationen die verschleierte Natur der Vorlage anzutasten?

In dieser Studie möchte ich Argumente sammeln, die eine solche Auffassung des Übersetzens in der Psalter-Wiedergabe der LXX wahrscheinlich machen. Dies soll in zwei Schritten geschehen. Zuerst erscheint eine Reihe von hermeneutischen Zeugnissen aus dem 2. und 1. Jh.v.Chr., die mit einem doppelten Sinn der Texte, v.a. der biblischen Texte rechnen, d.h. mit einer vordergründigen, offen zu Tage liegenden und einer verborgenen, erst der Erforschung zugänglichen Bedeutung. Dann soll Ps 28(29),6 sozusagen die Probe aufs Exempel liefern und zeigen, wie sich eine scheinbar sinnlose Übersetzung in einen schriftgelehrten Zusammenhang einordnet und so ihren Sinn enthüllt.

2. Hermeneutik des dunklen Bibeltexts im Altertum

Zunächst ist auf Stellen wie Ps 48(49),2-5; 77(78),2 zu verweisen. In Ps 48(49),5 öffnet der Psalmensänger "mit der Harfe sein Rätsel", in LXX: τὸ πρόβλημα μου, die gewöhnliche Wiedergabe von *hīdā* in LXX. Lied mit Leierbegleitung (*kinnôr*) und Rätsel, d.h. eine schwer lösbare Frage, sind hier miteinander verbunden und bezeichnen als Titel die ganze Komposition von Ps 48(49). Ps 77(78),2 spricht seinerseits im 1. Halbvers vom *mašal*, während der in prophetischem Stil formulierte 2. Stichos (*nû*) hif für "kundgeben") parallel zum *mašal* die "*hīdôt* aus der Vorzeit" erwähnt. Beides, *mašal* und *hīdôt*, sind Bezeichnungen für den Inhalt des Psalms. Dieser entfaltet somit Fragen und Rätsel, deren Sinn und Bedeutung enträtselt und verstanden werden wollen.

Jesus Sirach (Anfang 2. Jh.) gibt dem Weisen u.a. die Aufgabe, "die Verborgenenheiten der Sprüche zu untersuchen und sich in den Rätseln der Vergleiche auszukennen" (2). Die Kommentatoren machen sich über diese "Verborgenenheiten der Sprüche" und über diese "Rätsel der Vergleiche" (*mešalīm*) wenig Gedanken (3). Jedenfalls gibt es rätselvolle,

(2) Sir 39,3: ἀπόκρυφα παροιμιῶν ἐκζητήσει, καὶ ἐν αἰνίγμασιν παραβολῶν ἀναστραφήσεται. In 39,7, 2. Stichos, "sinnt (der Weise) über seine Verborgenenheiten nach", nämlich über die Verborgenenheiten Gottes.

(3) J. MARBÖCK, "Sir., 38, 24-39,11: Der schriftgelehrte Weise. Ein Beitrag zu Gestalt und Werk Ben Siras", *La Sagesse de l'Ancien Testament* (éd. M. GILBERT) (BETL 51; Leuven-Gembloux 1979) 293-316, hier 312, denkt wegen Sir 39,7b an eine von Gott offenbarte Weisheit, die dem Menschen aus eigenem Vermögen unzugänglich wäre. Die "Verborgenenheiten und Rätsel" sind jedoch durch die literarischen Begriffe "Sprüche" und "Vergleiche" als Verborgeneheit einer Textbedeutung qualifiziert. Worte, Texte sind es, in denen "Verborgenes und Rätselhaftes" vorkom-

verborgene, d.h. schwer verstehbare Texte oder Worte, die der Weise erforscht⁽⁴⁾.

Nach 11QPs^a, Kol. XXVII, ll. 2-11 sind die Psalmen, die David schrieb, ein Werk des "Geistes der Einsicht (*nebūnā*) und der Erleuchtung (*ōrā*)", also von Weisheit erfüllte Prophetien⁽⁵⁾.

Aristobulos "der Peripatetiker" (etwa Mitte 2. Jh.v.Chr.)⁽⁶⁾ hat in der Tora zwischen dem vordergründigen scheinbaren Sinn gewisser Ausdrücke und der in ihnen verborgenen wahren Bedeutung unterschieden. Er formuliert diese Beschaffenheit mancher Ausdrücke der Tora grundsätzlich wie folgt⁽⁷⁾: "Denn oft will unser Gesetzgeber sprechen, indem er Worte wählt, die sich auf andere Sachverhalte beziehen: ich meine auf solche des Anscheins. Er (aber) legt wesenhafte Strukturen und Aufbaugesetze grosser Sachverhalte offen. Solche also, die gut denken können, bewundern seine Weisheit (i.e. die Weisheit Moses) und den göttlichen Geist, dementsprechend er ja auch als Prophet berühmt geworden ist... Solchen dagegen, denen diese Kraft und Einsicht abgeht, und die nur auf das Geschriebene achten, scheint er überhaupt nichts Bedeutendes zu sagen zu haben". Die Texte haben eine Wortbedeutung, die eine Scheinbedeutung ist. Sie besitzen jedoch eine verborgene Bedeutung, welche die wahre Bedeutung ist.

Bei Aristobulos begründet diese Unterscheidung von wörtlicher Scheinbedeutung und verborgenem wahren Sinn die Allegorie, oder vielleicht zutreffender gesagt, die metaphorische Deutung bestimmter anthropomorpher Bezeichnungen Gottes im Pentateuch⁽⁸⁾. Aber das so formulier-

men. H. STADELMANN, *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter*. Eine Untersuchung zum Berufsbild des vormakkabäischen *Sōfēr* unter Berücksichtigung seines Verhältnisses zu Priester-, Propheten- und Weisheitslehrertum (WUNT, 2. Reihe 6; Tübingen 1980) 225 definiert die "Verborgenenheiten" und "Rätsel" von V.3 als "die traditionellen Weisheitsgegenstände des Maschal, des Rätselwortes und der Erzählung des Weisen, die Erfahrung, bzw. Erkenntnisse übermitteln will" und zitiert dazu 1 Kön 10,1-3; Ps 49,5; Spr 1,6; die Ijob-Erzählung als ganze; Sir 8,8f; 9,14f; 27,11. Etwas Spezifisches an den Verborgenenheiten und Rätseln sieht sie dabei nicht. G. VON RAD, *Weisheit in Israel* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1970) 55 stellt mit Recht die Rätsel von Sir 39,3 mit den Rätseln der Weisheitsliteratur im AT zusammen, ohne aber dem Parallelismus "Verborgenenheiten/Rätsel" hier eine besondere Bedeutung beizumessen.

⁽⁴⁾ Nach O. RICKENBACHER, *Weisheitsperikopen bei Ben Sira* (OBO 1; Freiburg/Schweiz – Göttingen 1973) 183-184 setzt Jesus Sirach hier die Dreiteilung Tora (38, 34d), Propheten (39,1) und Weisheit (39,2-3) voraus.

⁽⁵⁾ J. A. SANDERS, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll* (Ithaca, NY 1967) 136-137; id., *The Psalm Scroll of Qumrān Cave 11 (11QPs)* (DJD IV; Oxford 1965) 48, 91-93, Tafel XVI.

⁽⁶⁾ N. WALTER, *Fragmente jüdisch-hellenistischer Exegeten*. Aristobulos, Deme- trios, Aristes (Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit III, 2; Gütersloh 1975) 262.

⁽⁷⁾ Fragment 2 = EUSEBIUS, *Praeparatio evangelica* VIII,10,1-17, hier 10,3-5. Griechischer Text (neben den Ausg. Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica*): A.-M. DENIS, *Fragmenta pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt graeca una cum historicorum et auctorum Iudaeorum hellenistarum fragmentis* (Leiden 1970) 217-220, hier 217-218. Deutsche Übersetzung: WALTER, *Fragmente*, 270-271.

⁽⁸⁾ Zur "Allegorese" Aristobulos' siehe N. WALTER, *Der Thorausleger Aristobulos*. Untersuchungen zu seinen Fragmenten und zu pseudepigraphischen Resten der jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur (TU 86; Berlin 1964) 129-138; M. HENGEL, *Judentum und Hellenismus* (WUNT 10; Tübingen 1969) 298-300.

te Prinzip kann für irgendeine dunkle, nicht im wörtlichen Sinn akzeptable Stelle der Heiligen Schrift gelten, in der ja nichts sinnlos ist.

Aristobulos rechnet übrigens damit, dass es Texte gibt, deren wahren Sinn er nicht zu entdecken vermag: "Ich werde nun anfangen, der Reihe nach die Bezeichnungen zu nehmen, so gut ich es vermag. Wenn ich indessen den Sachverhalt nicht treffe und nicht überzeuge, dann behafte nicht den Gesetzgeber mit dem Fehler (ἀλογία), sondern mich, der ich nicht in der Lage bin, das von ihm Gedachte (νενοημένα) auseinanderzusetzen" ⁽⁹⁾. M.a.W. ist damit zu rechnen, dass Texte dem einfachen Verständnis widerstehen. Der Unterschied zur "Allegorese" der Alexandriner ist doppelt: es handelt sich bei ihnen um die Tora, nicht um die Psalmen, und die Texte der Tora sind an und für sich verständlich, bedürfen aber einer besonderen Interpretation. In den Psalmen (und wohl auch bei den Propheten) gibt es dagegen dunkle Texte, die daher eben auch als dunkle Stellen übersetzt werden müssen.

Eine Analogie zwischen der peinlich genauen Abbildung einer unverständlichen hebräischen Vorlage in der griechischen Übersetzung und gewissen Kopisten des biblischen Textes in Qumran und vor dem zweiten jüdischen Krieg mag unsere Annahme weiter stützen, derzufolge die LXX-Übersetzer der Psalmen ihre Vorlage wörtlich und ohne Rücksicht auf Sinn und Verständlichkeit reproduzierten. Unter den biblischen Handschriften in Qumran gibt es solche, die einen archaischen Text ohne Modernisierungen und Glättungen enthalten, z.B. 1QIs^b (im Gegensatz zu dem vulgären Text derselben Höhle, 1QIs^a). Ferner bezeugt die griechische Dodekaprophetenrolle von Naḥal Ḥever einen LXX Text, der in der 1. Hälfte des 1. Jh.n.Chr. an eine hebräische Vorlage angeglichen wurde. Es gab also vor dem 1. jüdischen Krieg Tradenten biblischer Texte, die für strenge Übereinstimmung einerseits zwischen Vorlage und Abschrift und andererseits zwischen hebräischer Vorlage und griechischer Übersetzung sorgten ⁽¹⁰⁾. Hinter dieser Einstellung steht eine Auffassung, für die jede Einzelheit des Textes ihre Bedeutung hat. Liegt es nicht nahe, eine ähnliche Einstellung bereits im Kreise der jüdischen Übersetzer der Psalmen anzunehmen, die den Text ihrer Vorlage auch dort bewahrten, wo sie in ihm keinen Sinn sahen, ja ihn vielleicht gerade dort wörtlicher übertrugen, weil das fehlende Verständnis Adaptierungen an die griechische Sprache ausschloss?

Ein letztes Argument für bewusst gewollte dunkle Übersetzungen im Psalter der LXX ist die *Vetus latina*. Das *Psalterium gallicanum* folgt nämlich dieser Praxis aufs genaueste, obwohl bei diesem lateinischen Übersetzer ja nicht wie beim LXX-Dolmetscher behauptet werden kann, er habe die Sprache seiner Vorlage oft nicht mehr verstanden, so dass er zu Verlegenheitsübersetzungen greifen musste. Als Beispiel möge etwa Ps 140 (141),6-7

⁽⁹⁾ Fragment 2; *Praep. ev.* VIII,10,6; DENIS, *Fragmenta*, 218; WALTER, *Fragmente*, 271.

⁽¹⁰⁾ D. BARTHÉLEMY, "Histoire du texte hébraïque de l'Ancien Testament", *Études d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament* (éd. D. BARTHÉLEMY) (OBO 21; Fribourg/Suisse – Göttingen 1978) 341-381, hier 351-355, id., "History of the Hebrew Text", *IDB Suppl.* (Abingdon – Nashville 1976) 878-884, hier 880-882.

dienen: *absorti sunt iuncti petrae iudices eorum / audient verba mea quoniam potuerunt; sicut crassitudo terrae erupta est super terram / dissipata sunt ossa nostra secus infernum*, oder Ps 67 (68), 13-14: *rex virtutum dilecti * dilecti: et speciei domus dividere spolia; si dormiatis inter medios cleros pinnae columbae deargentatae / et posteriora dorsi eius in pallore auri*. Obwohl der lateinische Übersetzer des LXX-Psalters das Griechische als lebendige Sprache kannte, hat er solche "Surrealismen" der LXX wortwörtlich im Lateinischen nachgebildet. Das deutet darauf hin, dass er diese Texte trotz ihrer Dunkelheit nicht als sinnlos auffasste, sondern ihnen einen verborgenen wahren Sinn zuerkannte. Anders als er hat Hieronymus in den *Psalmi iuxta Hebraicum* einen verständlichen Sinn angestrebt.

Zusammenfassend können wir festhalten, dass der Psalmentext in den Augen seiner griechischen Übersetzer im 2. Jh.v.Chr. ein Buch mit einer Bedeutung war, die nicht überall klar und verständlich zu Tage liegen konnte. Aber eine Bedeutung hatte es auf jeden Fall, war diese nun evident und klar oder verborgen und dunkel! Es ist ein Buch, dessen Sinn sich den Lesern stellenweise geheimnisvoll entziehen mochte. Dies entspricht aber schon der Situation der Bibel für die Tora und wohl auch für die Propheten, wo dem Ausleger auch nicht alles zugänglich ist, obgleich alles absolut sicher eine Bedeutung hat⁽¹⁾. Diese Überzeugung leitete wohl auch die Übersetzer der Psalmen und verwehrte es ihnen, dunkle Vorlagen anders als dunkel zu übersetzen.

3. Das Kalb und der Geliebte in Ps 28 (29),9

Ein erhellendes Beispiel für eine zunächst rätselhafte Übersetzung in LXX, deren Bedeutung sich jedoch aus dem Gesamtzusammenhang der schriftgelehrten Deutung des Psalms ergibt, ist Ps 28 (29),6. Es soll hier vorgestellt werden⁽²⁾.

In Ps 28 (29),6 führt der 2. Stichos in der Tat die seltsame Aussage ein: "und der Geliebte ist wie ein Sohn von Einhörnern" (καὶ ὁ ἡγαπημένος ὡς υἱὸς μονοκέρωτον). Der Geliebte strotzt von Kraft wie junge Bullen von Einhörnern oder Rhinozeroten. Aber wer ist der Geliebte? In V. 3-9 dominiert die donnernde Stimme des Herrn über den Wassern (V. 3) in ihrer gewaltigen Majestät (V. 4), die die Zedern des Libanon zerschmettert (V. 5-6a), Feuerlohen spaltet (V. 7), die Wüste erbeben (V. 8) und Hinden kreissen lässt und die Wälder entlaubt (V. 9). In solchem Zusammenhang gleicht die Verszeile mit dem Geliebten, der wie der junge Bulle von Einhörnern ist, einem Findling, der in eine ganz andere Landschaft verschlagen wurde.

⁽¹⁾ Siehe Aristeasbrief 162, 168: nichts ist (in der Tora) umsonst oder als rein erzählerisches Phantasiegebilde (μυθώδης) angeordnet: A. PELLETIER, *Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate* (SC 89; Paris 1962) 180-183.

⁽²⁾ Die Übers. der LXX von Ps 28 (29) wurde untersucht von N.A. VAN UCHELEN, "De LXX-Interpretatie van Ps 29", *Nederlandse Theologische Tijdschrift* 24 (1969-1970) 171-181 (ich danke dem Redaktionsstab von *Biblica* für den Hinweis auf diese Studie). In diesem Art. finden sich weitere Literaturhinweise.

Es ist möglich, dass der Ausdruck der Vorlage, *siryôn*, vom Übersetzer als *yešurîn* gelesen wurde, denn in Dtn 32,15; 33,5.26; Jes 44,2 steht das Partizip Perfekt ἡγαπημένος für diesen Terminus. Wie dem auch sei, was mag die Bedeutung dieser Zeile (V. 6b) für den Übersetzer gewesen sein?

Die parallele Verszeile (V. 6a) lautet: "und er (nämlich der Herr) wird sie (die Zedern des Libanon, V. 5) zermalmen wie das Kalb, den Libanon". So wie der Stichos dasteht, ist der Akkusativ "den Libanon" am ehesten als asyndetisch angeschlossenes Parallelglied zu den Zedern zu verstehen: "er wird sie zermalmen, den Libanon (wird er auch zermalmen)", und zwar wird er ihn zermalmen, wie er "das Kalb" zermalmt hat. Der Libanon ist wie "das Rind", das der Herr zermalmt hat, und wie die Libanonzedern, die er zerschmettert.

λεπτόνω, zermalmen entspricht dem hebräischen Stamm *dqq*, den der Übersetzer hier an Stelle von *rqd* gelesen haben mag. Der Ausdruck "zermalmtes Kalb" erinnert unweigerlich an das goldene Kalb, das Mose zerstoss. In der Tat verwendet MT in Ex 32,20 den Stamm *dqq*, zerstossen; LXX übertragen hier mit dem Adjektiv λεπτός. Die Möglichkeit einer Verbindung zwischen Psalm 28(29) und Exodus 32 scheint sich anzudeuten⁽¹³⁾. Lässt sie sich erhärten?

Zerstossen und zermalmt wird der Libanon wie die Zedern (V. 6a). Die Libanonzedern können in der Bibel die Arroganz der Macht versinnbildern, vgl. Jes 2,13; 10,33-34; Ez 31; Sach 11,1-2; 2 Kön 14,9 usw. In Jes 2,14 folgen als Bild für stolze Selbstüberhebung unmittelbar auf die übermütigen Zedern die Berge! Dem entspricht, dass der Libanon selbst und seine Zedern in Ps 28(29), 3-6 vom Herrn zerschmettert werden⁽¹⁴⁾. Ez 31,15 stellt nun gerade Ägypten als eine mächtige Libanonzeder vor, die in die Unterwelt hinabmuss, wobei der Libanon verdunkelt wird und alle Bäume auf dem Libanon absterben, während gleichzeitig die Wasser und Flüsse vertrocknen! In V. 16 stürzen dann auch die Libanonzedern zusammen mit dieser hochragendsten Ägyptenzeder in die Unterwelt hinunter.

Wer Ps 28(29),3-6 mit dieser Ezechielstelle zusammensieht, kann ihn als Allegorie über Ägypten lesen, das wie eine mächtige Zeder des Libanon durch die donnernde Stimme des Herrn gestürzt wird, also indirekt als Allegorie für die Befreiung der Israeliten aus der Macht Ägyptens, die gebrochen ist.

Die Donnerstimme des Herrn erdröhnt in Ps 28(29) über vielen Wassern (V. 3), und der Herr regiert die Urflut (V. 10). κατοικέω hat hier wohl diese gut bezeugte Bedeutung: regieren, verwalten. Auch dieser Zug des Psalms passt gut zur Befreiung der Israeliten durch das Schilfmeer, denn Stellen wie Jes 51,9-10; Ps 114 verbinden Durchzug durch das Schilfmeer und kosmische Bändigung der Chaosfluten. In wahnwitziger Selbstüberhe-

⁽¹³⁾ VAN UCHELEN, "LXX-Interpretatie", 175, Anm. 3 hat die Verbindung mit Ex 32 beobachtet.

⁽¹⁴⁾ So VAN UCHELEN, "LXX-Interpretatie", 178-179. Er meint (177-178), auch die "vielen Wasser" in V. 3 bezeichnen die Nationen. Wegen der Flut (*mabbûl*) in V. 10 ist das weniger wahrscheinlich, weil *mabbûl* nie die Völkerwelt bezeichnet.

bung brüstet sich Assur in Jes 37,24-25 zweier göttlicher Taten: er lege die Bäume des Libanon nieder, und er trockne die Wasserläufe Ägyptens aus. *Er* sei der Herr des Libanonwaldes und der ägyptischen Wasser! Das aber sind göttliche Machterweise, wie die oben erwähnte Stelle Ezechiels (31,15) und Nah 1,4 zeigen:

Er schalt das Meer und legte es trocken,
und alle Ströme liess er zur Wüste veröden,
es verwelkte der Baschan und der Karmel,
und das Sprossen des Libanon verwelkte.

Nach Sach 10,10-11 und 11,1-2 führt Gott die Heimkehr aus der Verbannung in einem neuen Exodus durch das trockengelegte Meer (10,11) auf den Libanon, der seine Pforten öffnen muss (10,10; 11,1), und dessen Zedern verbrennen, während seine Wälder umgehauen werden (11,1-2). Der neue Exodus besteht aus diesen zwei göttlichen Machterweisen: der Beherrschung der Fluten, die er trockenlegt, und der Zerschmetterung der Arroganz Assurs und Ägyptens, dargestellt im Bilde des Libanons und seiner Zedern (11,2).

Ps 28 (29),3-10 stellt eben dieses göttliche Werk dar: er zerschmettert den Libanon und seine Zedern, d.h. die Hybris Ägyptens, und er regiert als König der Welt die Chaosflut (V. 10).

In diesen Zusammenhang passt die Erwähnung der Wüste von Kadesch (V. 8), die in Num 20,1 erwähnt wird, wo Mose die wasserlose Wüste in ein reich bewässertes Land verwandelte.

Der Verbindungen zwischen Exodus und Ps 28 (29) sind wohl noch mehr! "Geliebter", ἡγαπημένος, erscheint in LXX als Titel für Abraham (2 Chr 20,7; Dan 3,35), Benjamin (Dtn 33,12), Salomo (Neh 13,26), für Gott (Jes 5,1.7), am häufigsten jedoch für Israel (Dtn 32,15; 33,5.26; Jes 44,2; Bar 3,37). In Dtn 32,15; 33,5.26; Jes 44,2 ist die hebräische Vorlage des Titels *yešurûn*. Isaak, Gen 22,2.12.16, heisst ἀγαπητός; in Ps 59 (60),7 = Ps 107 (108),7 heissen die Israeliten und Judäer unter David ἀγαπητοί, wenn wir den Psalm im Lichte seines Titels in Ps 59 (60) deuten; in Ps 126 (127),2 sind es die Lieblinge des Herrn. Es ist bekannt, dass ἀγαπητός oft das hebräische *yahîd*, Einziger, wiedergibt. Beide Begriffe, das Partizip ἡγαπημένος und das Verbaladjektiv ἀγαπητός, enthalten gerne die Nuance des bevorzugt Geliebten, z.B. in Gen 22,2 (wo Verbaladjektiv und eine Verbalform nebeneinanderstehen), Dtn 21,15-16; Jer 38,20 (LXX 31,20), u.a.

Yešurûn bezeichnet in Dtn 32,15 das Israel der Anfänge, wie V. 10-14 zeigen, wo der Weg von der Wüste zum gelobten Land dichterisch zusammengefasst dargestellt ist. Sowohl in Dtn 32 als auch im Segen von Dtn 33 ist der Titel "Geliebter", ἡγαπημένος der Name Israels im Munde Moses, der zum Israel der Exodusgeneration spricht. In Jes 44,2 verknüpft LXX gegen den MT den Titel "Geliebter", ἡγαπημένος, mit dem Namen Israel, der in MT fehlt. Der Kontext dieses Titels ist der der Erwählung Israels.

Es ist nach alledem wohl nicht möglich, dem Wort ἡγαπημένος in Ps 28 (29),6 eine andere Bedeutung zu geben als die Israels, des erwählten Ge-

liebten Gottes in seiner Stärke, wie es übrigens auch Dtn 32,15 andeutet, dort freilich in negativer Weise.

Während der Stolz des Libanon, d.h. Ägyptens, wie das goldene Kalb zerstoßen wird, ist Israels Kraft unbezwingbar.

Ps 29(30),2 und 9 erwähnen das heilige Haus Gottes, wo sich alle vor ihm niederwerfen und ihm Ehre darbringen. Die Ehre, die δόξα, ist dreimal genannt (V. 1.2.9)! Die Doppelübersetzung des ersten Halbverses in V. 1: "bringt dem Herrn, (ihr) Gottessöhne, bringt dem Herrn Widder-söhne dar!" evoziert Opfer, d. h. die liturgische Verehrung Gottes im Heiligtum.

Nun steht nach LXX im Titel ἐξοδίου σκηνῆς. Allgemein wird dies auf den letzten Tag des Laubhüttenfestes gedeutet⁽¹⁵⁾. Das Laubhüttenfest wird jedoch nie mit σκηνή im Singular bezeichnet. Dieses heisst entweder ἐορτή (τῶν) σκηνῶν (Lev 23,34; 2 Chr 8,13; Esr 3,4) oder σκηνοπηγία in verschiedenen Verbindungen (Dtn 16,16; 31,10; 3 Esr 5,51; Sach 14,16.18.19; 1 Makk 10,21; 2 Makk 1,9.18)⁽¹⁶⁾. ἐξοδίου bedeutet dagegen in LXX tatsächlich den "Abschluss" von Festen, so in Lev 23,36; Num 29,35; Dtn 16,8; 2 Chr 7,9; Neh 8,18. Es entspricht an all diesen Stellen hebräischem 'aššārāt. σκηνή bezeichnet indessen sehr oft das Zelt, die Stiftshütte. So legt sich als Hypothese die Frage nahe, ob hier im Psalmtitel nicht das Zeltheiligtum von Ex 35–40 gemeint ist. Folgende Beobachtungen könnten diese Hypothese stützen.

1. Ps 29(30) entspricht nach seinem Titel in MT und LXX dem Tempelweihfest. Damit ist wohl der nachexilische zweite Tempel gemeint, weil der Psalm, ein Dankespsalm an die durchlittene Leidenszeit erinnert und für die Errettung dankt (V. 3-4; 11-12), also wohl die babylonische Gefangenschaft im Blick hat⁽¹⁷⁾. Der Wiederaufbau des Tempels nach dem Exil ist in LXX Thema der mit Haggai und Sacharja betitelten Psalmen (Ps 145-148 [146-148]). Der Bau des zweiten Tempels ist demgemäss im Psalter der LXX offenbar wichtig. Entsprechend könnte vor Ps 29(30), der dem nachexilischen Gotteshaus gewidmet ist, dieser Psalm (28[29]) die Errichtung des ersten Heiligtums in der Wüste feiern, während 1 Kön 8 das Weihegebet Salomos für den ersten Tempel überliefert. Jedes der drei Heiligtümer hätte so in der Bibel sein ihm entsprechendes Weihegebet.

⁽¹⁵⁾ In Lev 23,36; Num 29,35 bezeichnet ἐξοδίου den letzten Tag von Sukkôt, in Dtn 16,8 den letzten Tag der Mazzôt; es steht für hebr. 'aššārāt. Vgl. P. HARLÉ – D. PRALON, *Le Lévitique* (La Bible d'Alexandrie III; Paris 1988) 191. In Ps 28(29) deuten Philo, Theodoret und die Syrohexapla den Titel als Abschluss des Laubhüttenfestes, siehe A. RAHLFS, *Psalmi cum Odis* (Göttingen 1967) ad loc. VAN UCHELEN, "LXX-Interpretatie", 171-174, baut seine Deutung von Ps 28(29) in LXX ganz auf diesen Bezug des Psalms auf das Laubhüttenfest auf. Diesen Bezug begründet für ihn die Analogie zwischen Ps 28(29) und Sach 14,16-19. Er anerkennt auch loyal, dass die jüdische liturgische Tradition Ps 28(29) nicht mit dem Laubhütten-, sondern mit dem Wochenfest verknüpft (abgesehen von BSuk 55a) (S. 173).

⁽¹⁶⁾ Diesen Einwand macht VAN UCHELEN, "LXX-Interpretatie", 171-172, gegen sich selbst, schiebt ihn aber wegen des folgenden ἐξοδίου gleich wieder weg.

⁽¹⁷⁾ VAN UCHELEN, "LXX-Interpretatie", 173-174, versteht dagegen diese Weihe vom salomonischen Tempel.

2. Der Sinn des Wortes ἐξόδιον bedeutet zunächst ganz allgemein Ausgang. Es ist das substantivierte Neutrum des Adjektivs ἐξόδιος, welches so etwas wie "ausgängig", "weggängig", den Ausgang betreffend bedeutet. Das neutrische Nomen bezeichnet den Ausgang eines Spiels, einer Tragödie, des Winters, aber ebenfalls in einem Oxyrrhinchus-Papyrus aus dem 1. Jh.n.Chr. einen Torweg, also einen konkreten Ausgang⁽¹⁸⁾.

Nun erzählt Ex 40,34-35, wie die Herrlichkeit des Herrn das soeben aufgerichtete Zelt erfüllte. Zweimal fällt dabei der Begriff Herrlichkeit. Gleich darauf fährt der Erzähler fort und berichtet, wie die Israeliten *mit dem Zelt* aufbrachen, als sich die Herrlichkeit zum Zeichen des Aufbruchs über das Zelt erhob (V. 36). ἐξόδιον σκηνῆς ergäbe einen dieser Erzählung entsprechenden Sinn, wenn es als "Ausgang des Zeltes", d. h. als Aufbruch der Stiftshütte verstanden werden dürfte. Falls der Titel des Psalms 28(29) eine Analogie zwischen Ex 40 und diesem Psalm andeuten will, wird auch das Herbeibringen der Opfer-Widder (V. 1) sinnvoll: das Heiligtum ist geweiht, der Kult kann einsetzen.

4. Zusammenfassung: rein "chiffrierter" Text

Es gibt Hinweise auf eine Hermeneutik im Umkreis der LXX-Übersetzung, die mit gewollt dunklen Formulierungen gewisser biblischer Stellen rechnet. Solche Formulierungen könnten auch als "chiffriert" bezeichnet werden, d. h. als unverständlich für alle, die nicht über den Schlüssel, den Code dafür verfügen. Die Übersetzer der LXX haben solche Texte nicht dekodiert, sondern vielmehr die kodierte Formulierung beibehalten. Sie haben die Dunkelheit der Formulierungen respektiert, weil sie darin eine Absicht der zu übersetzenden Vorlage erkannten, die auch in der Übersetzung aufscheinen sollte.

Ps 28(29) ist dafür ein Beispiel. V. 6 ist zunächst rätselhaft. Er scheint aus dem Kontext des Psalms herauszufallen. Aber mit dem Code einer bestimmten Gesamtexegese des Psalms in LXX enthüllt sich für V. 6 eine sinnvolle Bedeutung.

In der Tat haben die Übersetzer der LXX Ps 28(29) als poetische oder hymnische Paraphrase des Exodus gedeutet, vergleichbar dem Lied Ex 15. Anknüpfungspunkt für diese Deutung sind Berührungen im Vokabular des Psalms (Kalb, Geliebter, Herrlichkeit, Wüste, Fluten, Kadesch, *dqq*, λεπτύνω) mit der Exoduserzählung im Pentateuch (Ex, Dtn) sowie eine metaphorische oder allegorische Hermeneutik, die bestimmte Bilder (Libanon, Zedern, Urflut) im Lichte prophetischer Texte (Ezechiel, Sacharja, Nahum) auflöst. Ein Psalm wie Ps 114 mag diese Lektüre bestärkt haben, da auch dieser Psalm die Exoduserzählung hymnisch transponiert. Ferner kann der folgende Psalm, Ps 29(30) mit seinem Titel, der sich auf die Weihe des zweiten Tempels zu beziehen scheint, den Gedanken an das erste Zelt in der Wüste im vorhergehenden Psalm aus Gründen der Symmetrie nahegelegt haben.

⁽¹⁸⁾ H. G. LIDDELL – R. SCOTT – H. S. JONES, *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford 1966) s.v., 596a.

Ist mit solchen Beobachtungen *bewiesen*, dass die LXX-Übersetzer Ps 28 (29) so verstanden haben, wie es hier vorgeschlagen wird? Das Argument, auf dem der Beweisgang beruht, ist die Kohärenz des Vokabulars, der Bilder und der Unterschiede der LXX im Vergleich mit dem masoretischen Text, die sich alle wie Mosaiksteine zu dieser Gesamtdeutung zusammenfügen.

Biblisches Institut
Universität Fribourg
CH-1700 Fribourg

Adrian SCHENKER

RES BIBLIOGRAPHICAE

Von der Steinzeit zu Alexander d. Gr. Zur neuen "Geschichte Palästinas" von G. W. Ahlström (*)

Das Erscheinen seines Hauptwerkes hat G. W. Ahlström (A.) nicht mehr erlebt. Er starb im Jahre 1992. Anders als R. de Vaux, dessen in mancher Hinsicht vergleichbares Werk⁽¹⁾ in der Richterzeit abbricht, hat er aber kein Fragment hinterlassen, sondern ein abgeschlossenes Manuskript, das auch das Vorwort mit den Danksagungen enthielt. Manche Inkonsistenzen, Unklarheiten, Wiederholungen und Umständlichkeiten in der Darstellung können aber darauf verweisen, daß es ihm nicht vergönnt war, die letzte Feile an das Manuskript anzulegen. Um so mehr muß man D. Edelman dafür danken, daß sie das Werk ihres Lehrers posthum zum Druck geführt und herausgegeben hat. Vergleichbar mit R. de Vaux' "Histoire" ist der große Zugriff, der das Werk über die gängigen Lehrbücher hinaushebt⁽²⁾, ein Werk, das mit der Steinzeit einsetzt, die vorisraelitische Geschichte Palästinas ausführlich darstellt, die Umwelt und ihre Zeugnisse eingehend heranzieht und die archäologischen Befunde für die Geschichtsrekonstruktion kräftig auswertet.

Aber an diesem Punkt zeigen sich auch die Unterschiede. Bei A., der als Schüler I. Engnells aus einer ganz anderen Forschungstradition kommt als R. de Vaux, spielt die Archäologie im Vergleich mit den schriftlichen Überlieferungen eine erheblich größere Rolle. Die Interpretation von Texten, besonders biblischen, ist nicht die Stärke A.s. Wenn sie erfolgt, ist oft die Mutmaßung historischer Wahrscheinlichkeiten entscheidend, nicht der Aussagewille der Texte und der evtl. zu erhebende Überlieferungskern. Dahinter steht auch das Mißtrauen A.s. gegen den Geschichtswert atl. Tradi-

(*) Gösta W. AHLSTRÖM, *The History of Ancient Palestine from the Palaeolithic Period to Alexander's Conquest* with a Contribution by Gary O. Rollefson edited by Diana Edelman (JSOTSS 146). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1993. 990 p., 24 maps, 8 figures. 22 × 14, £60.00 - \$90.00.

(1) R. DE VAUX, *Histoire ancienne d'Israël*. Des origines à l'installation en Canaan (EB; Paris 1971); *La période des Juges* (EB; Paris 1973), auch engl.: *The Early History of Israel* I-II (London - Philadelphia 1978).

(2) Freilich wäre de Vaux' Werk, wenn es einen Abschluß erfahren hätte, noch ganz erheblich umfangreicher geworden als A.s. "History", ja hätte wohl die Ausmaße von R. KITTELS klassischer Darstellung (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel* I-III, 1.2 [Stuttgart 1923-1929 in unterschiedlichen Auflagen]) erreicht. Der vollendete erste und der fragmentarische zweite Band, der bis in die Richterzeit reicht, entsprechen etwa dem Umfang von A.s. "History", die mit dem Auftreten Alexanders d. Gr. endet.

tionen, noch mehr aber eine Grundsatzentscheidung: A. will die Geschichtsrekonstruktion aus ihrer Fixierung auf Israel lösen und eine Darstellung "neuen Typs" bieten, eben eine Geschichte Palästinas, nicht nur Israels: "...I have felt the need to try to present the history of the peoples of Palestine through the millennia in a form freed from the bias of the biblical writers, which is difficult" (10). Das ist eine respektable und gleichzeitig im Hinblick auf die atl. Überlieferungen (die doch mehr als theologische "bias" enthalten) bedauerliche Aufgabenstellung. Sie bewirkt einerseits, daß die Geschichte der transjordanischen Völker dankenswerterweise so ausführlich dargestellt wird wie in kaum einem anderen vergleichbaren Werk und die Umweltreiche manchmal fast zu breit berücksichtigt werden. Sie führt andererseits aber auch dazu, daß die atl. Traditionen über die Frühgeschichte Israels fast restlos aus der Diskussion ausgeschaltet werden. Das ist ein Verfahren, mit dem A. keineswegs allein steht. Trotzdem sollte die Möglichkeit, in den Überlieferungen über die Frühzeit Israels geschichtlich tragfähige Informationen zu ermitteln, nicht von vornherein und pauschal von der Hand gewiesen werden. Allerdings ist A. — wenn man von den Frühzeit-Traditionen absieht — auch kein strikter "Minimalist", der nur das aus dem AT als historisch gelten läßt, was sich durch "external evidence" (Umwelttexte, Archäologie) verifizieren läßt. Sonst wäre schwerlich eine derartig umfangreiche Darstellung entstanden.

In ihrem Vorwort verweisen N.P. Lemche und D. Edelman auf die Originalität A.s, der manche Grundauffassungen der "Uppsala-Schule" hinter sich ließ, in seinem Chicagoer Wirken einen Brückenkopf zwischen europäischer und amerikanischer Forschung bildete und ständig mit den neuesten Entwicklungen im Gespräch blieb. Letzteres wird durch den Anm.-Apparat des Buches eindrucksvoll dokumentiert⁽³⁾. Vor allem aber sind es A.s eigene Arbeiten⁽⁴⁾, die die Basis für das vorliegende Werk bilden, in dem so etwas wie die Summe seiner Lebensarbeit vorliegt.

I

Für die Vorgehensweise A.s ist der erste Teil der "Introduction" wichtig, der unter dem Titel "History and Historiography" (19-53) die Quellen für die Geschichtsrekonstruktion diskutiert. An vorderster Stelle stehen für A. die Ergebnisse der Archäologie und die Umwelttexte. Die atl. Überlieferungen müssen demgegenüber zurückstehen, denn sie bieten "religious historiography" (28), werden von einem "religious zeal" (43) dirigiert und tragen überhaupt einen "religious and propagandistic character"

⁽³⁾ Die herangezogene Literatur reicht, von Ausnahmen abgesehen, allerdings nur bis 1986.

⁽⁴⁾ Als Beispiele seien nur genannt: *Royal Administration and National Religion in Ancient Palestine* (Studies in the History of the Ancient Near East 1; Leiden 1982); dazu vgl. meine Rez. in *OLZ* 81 (1986) 154-156; *An Archaeological Picture of Iron Age Religions in Ancient Palestine* (StudOr 55.3; Helsinki 1984); *Who were the Israelites?* (Winona Lake, IN 1986). Die Bücher zeigen, wie eng in A.s Denken Geschichte und Religionsgeschichte zusammengehören.

(52), sind — historisch beurteilt — in vielen Fällen Fiktion. Das gilt besonders für diejenigen Texte (von Traditionen oder Überlieferungen spricht A. bezeichnenderweise selten), die aus der Zeit vor dem 10. Jh. v.Chr. zu berichten vorgeben. A. begründet dieses Urteil unterschiedlich, aber nie umfassend und überzeugend. So führt der Anachronismus "Ur der Chaldäer" über den Gedanken, daß hier eine Erfahrung der exilierten Judäer vorliegt, zu der Vermutung, "that the whole Abraham story is not a piece of history but rather is a literary product aimed at a religious and political situation of a much later time..." (31). Anscheinend wegen der Rolle von Meer und Wasser in der Schöpfungsmythologie folgert A.: "The Exodus legend with its motif of a people saved through the splitting of a sea also belongs to the same category of mythological fiction" (27). Abgesehen davon, daß die Argumentation an sich bestreitbar ist, wird hier von Einzelbeobachtungen aus sehr rasch und m.E. kurzschlüssig das Ganze beurteilt⁽⁵⁾. Aus einer etwas ausführlicheren Interpretation von Ri 3,12-30 ergibt sich, daß der Text nichts Geschichtliches enthält⁽⁶⁾. "...Ehud and Eglon can only be described as the two main characters in a literary drama" (39-40). Dieses Ergebnis wird flugs auf die gesamten Richter-Geschichten übertragen.

Da die Angaben des AT dem spbr Inschriftenmaterial nicht entsprechen, hatten die atl. Verfasser keine Kenntnis von den Vorgängen in Palästina vor dem 10. Jh. v.Chr. und bieten daher eine "imaginary history" (46) für die Zeit vor Schoschenk, dem ersten namentlich genannten Pharao. Dennoch hält A. an der Geschichtlichkeit Sauls, Davids und Salomos fest, obwohl weder ihr Name noch der ihres Reiches in Umweltquellen erscheint. Jedoch verweisen die archäologischen Befunde aus dieser Zeit auf "a governmental policy" (36).

Die Tragweite der Archäologie wird von A. zweifellos überschätzt. Ihre Ergebnisse sind durchaus mehrdeutig und interpretationsbedürftig — und sie hängen sehr stark vom vorausgesetzten Interpretationsrahmen ab, wie die Geschichte der Palästina-Archäologie zur Genüge zeigt. Die Umwelttexte tragen — was A. natürlich auch weiß — keinesfalls den Charakter "säkularer" Geschichtsdokumente, sondern sind ebenfalls religiös geprägt (vgl. die Meša-Inschrift) und tendenziös gestaltet (vgl. den "Sieg" Salmannassers III. bei Karkar). Die atl. Texte sind demgegenüber in größere, redaktionell geschaffene Zusammenhänge (Pentateuch, DtrG., Chronistisches Werk) eingebunden, die den Stempel einer dezidiert theologischen Geschichtsschreibung späterer Epochen aufweisen. Dieser Tatbestand entbindet aber nicht von der Rückfrage nach dem evtl. vorhandenen Geschichtswert, sondern ruft nach Interpretation, vor allem in Form der überlieferungsgeschichtlichen Analyse. Diese aber fehlt in dem Argumentationsgang A.s, der fast ausschließlich auf die literarische Ebene rekurriert, nahezu

⁽⁵⁾ Das Urteil hinsichtlich der Abraham-Geschichten wird später *mutatis mutandis* auf die Erzväter-Überlieferungen überhaupt ausgedehnt.

⁽⁶⁾ Dabei spielt auch ein historisches Ermessensurteil eine Rolle: "It is improbable that any Moabite kingdom in the period before Saul could have reached as far north as the territories of the Jordan river, especially if the Ammonites were expanding westward" (39). Eine Begründung für diese Ansicht sucht man vergebens.

vollständig. Dieser erste Abschnitt zeigt — über die Art des Umgangs mit den Quellen hinaus — auch schon etwas von der Darstellungsweise des Buches: Es wird nicht in fortlaufenden Gedankengängen argumentiert, sondern eher assoziativ, sprunghaft, den Gegenstand umkreisend. Diese Eigenart, die man auch in anderen Büchern A.s beobachten kann, macht das Werk nicht zum Lehrbuch geeignet.

Das 1. Kapitel des Buches enthält die für die Darstellung grundlegenden Informationen über den Namen, die Geographie, das Klima, das Wegenetz und die Bodenschätze des Landes. Wie nicht anders zu erwarten, wird "Palästina" im klassischen, nicht im neuzeitlichen Sinn definiert und auf das Gebiet zwischen Beka'-Ebene und Sinai-Halbinsel einerseits, Mittelmeer und Arabischer Wüste andererseits bezogen. Damit ist der Bereich der folgenden Darstellung abgesteckt.

II

Das Kapitel über "Prehistoric Times", d.h. die Zeitspanne vom Paläolithikum bis zum Chalkolithikum, hat Gary O. Rollefson beigesteuert. Den Beginn der Frühen Steinzeit setzt er bereits mit 1,5 Millionen Jahren an ('Ubēdiye)(⁷). Zur sog. neolithischen Revolution merkt er an, daß es sich dabei um einen jahrhundertelangen, schrittweisen Prozeß handelte (ca. 8500-3700 v.Chr.). Die Singularität der Stadtmauer des präkeramisch-neolithischen Jericho läßt ihn (im Anschluß an O. Bar-Yosef) die Vermutung favorisieren, daß die Mauer kein Befestigungswerk war, sondern den Zweck hatte, die Siedlung vor den aus den westlichen Bergen herabströmenden Wassern der Regenzeit zu schützen und diese zu verteilen. Den Niedergang der Siedlungen des mittleren präkeramischen Neolithikums B führt er auf eine Erschöpfung der natürlichen Ressourcen (Ackerland und Wildbestand) zurück, ebenso die Wiederholung dieses Vorgangs um 6000 v.Chr. Die Entwicklung zum Chalkolithikum beruhe schließlich auch auf lokalen Veränderungen, nicht auf der Einwanderung neuer Völkerschaften. Insgesamt wird das Chalkolithikum sehr knapp behandelt; die eigenartige chalkolithische Kultur des Gölän wird nicht einmal erwähnt.

III

Auch A., der von der Frühbronzezeit an wieder die Darstellung übernimmt, ist skeptisch gegenüber der Annahme von Kulturwandlungen infolge Immigrationen. So seien die neuen bzw. fremden Züge in der materiellen Kultur der Proto-Urbanen Periode durch friedliche Kontakte zu erklären.

(⁷) Dazu vgl. O. BAR-YOSEF, "Research on Stone Age Archaeology in Israel Since 1948", *Recent Archaeology in the Land of Israel* (ed. H. SHANKS) (Washington, D.C. - Jerusalem 1984) 3-16, der als Zeitspanne für die Ansetzung von 'Ubēdiye ein Alter von 0,7 bis 1,1 Millionen Jahren nennt (5). Daraus wählt H. Weippert den untersten Wert und setzt 700.000 v.Chr. als vermutliche Obergrenze des Paläolithikums an, vgl. H. WEIPPERT, *Palästina in vorhellenistischer Zeit* (Handbuch der Archäologie. Vorderasien II, Band 1; München 1988) — ein Buch, das A. nicht mehr heranziehen konnte.

Die Entstehung der Städte mit ihren starken Befestigungen in der FrBr führt aber auch A. auf ausländische Einflüsse zurück, die allerdings nicht von einer Invasion fremder Elemente herrühren müssen. Andererseits könnte das Auftreten der Hirbet Kerak-Ware in der FrBr II/III mit der Ankunft von "some newcomers from the north" (130) zusammenhängen. Derartige Folgerungen vor allem aus der Eigenart der Keramik, aber auch aus anderen Elementen der materiellen Kultur begegnen in der Folge noch öfter. Die Erklärung des Zusammenbruchs der FrBr III durch eine amoritische Invasion beurteilt A. als "a mistake" (133). Vielmehr handle es sich, durch politische und sozio-ökonomische Faktoren (Klimaänderung, zunehmende Aridität und Entwaldung) bedingt, um "a shift in population density and in life style" (139). Das bedeutet, daß der nomadische Pastoralismus anwuchs, aber als einheimisches Phänomen. Aber auch hier rechnet A. angesichts einiger auf den Norden verweisender neuer Züge in der materiellen Kultur mit "new settlers arriving from the north" (143).

Diesem Interpretationsrahmen entsprechend, lehnt es A. ab, die Entstehung der mbr Kultur und die Reurbanisierung des Landes mit der Hypothese einer (proto-kanaanäischen) Masseneinwanderung in Verbindung zu bringen, sondern bevorzugt eine multikausale Erklärung, die auch noch regional unterschiedlich erfolgt. Diese Sicht der Dinge ist vor allem eine Folgerung aus den recht disparaten Grabungsergebnissen.

In einem Exkurs über "Abraham/Abram" begründet A. ausführlicher seine Skepsis gegenüber den Abraham- und überhaupt den Vätertraditionen und sein Urteil, "that the narrator of the Genesis stories did not have accurate knowledge about the prehistory of the Israelites" (186). Dem könnte man sogar zustimmen, wenn man den "narrator" mit dem Endredaktor gleichsetzte. Aber A. verfährt zu pauschal, wenn er sein Verdikt über die *Gesamtheit* der Überlieferung ausspricht und folgert, daß die Abrahamtraditionen in ihrer gegenwärtigen Form nach dem Exil formuliert sind⁽⁸⁾ und in ihnen Abraham als der ideale Ahnherr Israels und Judas⁽⁹⁾ erscheint. Obwohl in diesem Zusammenhang auch wirkliche Probleme angesprochen werden (z.B. die fehlende Reflexion der ägyptischen Herrschaft über Palästina in den Vätergeschichten)⁽¹⁰⁾, ist es doch bezeichnend, daß A. zumeist auf P-Texte bzw. Gen 14 rekurriert, für die seine Urteile wohl zutreffen mögen, die aber keineswegs für die *ganze* Abraham-, geschweige denn die Vätertradition repräsentativ sind. Differenzierung ist hier angebracht, keine Pauschalbeurteilung.

⁽⁸⁾ Auch das ist richtig, wenn man die "gegenwärtige Form" betont. Dann bleibt es aber unverständlich, warum nicht konsequent überlieferungsgeschichtlich hinter diese Form zurückgefragt wird.

⁽⁹⁾ Das gilt nur für einige, gewiß nicht für alle Texte der Abrahamüberlieferung. Interessant ist es, daß A. hier — anscheinend unbewußt — wenigstens teilweise die Beurteilung der Väter durch J. Wellhausen übernimmt, ein Beispiel mehr für die sich aufdrängende Beobachtung, daß die gegenwärtige atl. Wissenschaft sich wieder stark Fragestellungen, Methoden und Ansichten des ausgehenden 19. Jahrhunderts annähert.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Kein wirkliches Problem ist die Erwähnung der Philister in der Vätertradition, wenn man nicht einseitig literarisch, sondern überlieferungsgeschichtlich denkt.

In der MBr gab es nach A. aber auch einwandernde Gruppen aus dem Norden, die sich in Palästina in einer Oberschicht mit hurritischen Namen und in Ägypten nach friedlicher Infiltration und schließlicher Machtübernahme in der Hyksosherrschaft etablierten. In Häusern dieser Zeit aus Ägypten sieht A. übrigens die Vorläufer für das Vierraumhaus in Palästina. Das mbr Transjordanien war, wie die Ausgrabungsfunde zeigen, keineswegs nur von Nomaden bevölkert. Es gab seßhaftes Leben (wohl vorwiegend im Jordantal und im nördlichen Landesteil) neben Nomadentum und Transhumanz. Das Verhältnis beider Phänomene zueinander bedarf noch der Klärung⁽¹¹⁾.

In der Darstellung der SpBr, die A. wie üblich als Fortsetzung der MBr mit gewissen Änderungen und als Zeit der ägyptischen Oberherrschaft versteht, ist der Abschnitt über die Amarnazeit besonders interessant. A. bestreitet entschieden (und mit Recht), daß die Texte eine Bauernrevolte ("peasant revolt") widerspiegeln. Er glaubt auch nicht, daß sie auf eine Zeit der Anarchie in Syrien und Palästina und den Niedergang der ägyptischen Herrschaft verweisen, was aber die Aussagen der einschlägigen Briefe doch wohl zu sehr verharmlost. Für eine entschiedene Schwächung der ägyptischen Hegemonie sprechen die Tatbestände, die A. selbst anschließend nennt: der Druck der Hethiter nach Süden, die Sonderstellung des Staates Amurru, die Expansionsbestrebungen Labajas von Sichem und seiner Söhne, die Aktivitäten der 'apīru.

Besondere Beachtung finden spbr Ortslagen (vor allem Hazor) und ihre Tempel. Das sog. Stelenheiligtum in Hazor interpretiert A. (wie Y. Yadin) als Tempel einer Mondgottheit und die Stelen um die Statue der sitzenden Gottheit als Darstellung eines kanaanäischen Pantheons. Den "Amman Airport temple" beurteilt er (wie L. G. Herr) als Krematorium und erschließt daraus unter Verweis auf 1 Sam 31,11-13 und die Ungewöhnlichkeit der Totenverbrennung unter Semiten die Existenz von Einwanderern aus dem Norden in Transjordanien.

Die in den ägyptischen Texten genannten "Schasu" (ššw)⁽¹²⁾ bezeichnen nach A. (und fast allgemeiner Ansicht) die Nomaden Palästinas und Südsyriens. In ihnen sieht A. eine wichtige Wurzel des späteren Israel: "...we have to reckon with the fact that many of them have settled in the

⁽¹¹⁾ Interessant ist in diesem Zusammenhang die knappe Kritik an M.B. Rowton (215, Anm. 7). Dessen "dimorphic society" nennt A. "a misnomer", und das wohl mit Recht. Richtig gesehen hätte Rowton die Interaktion zwischen seßhaften und nichtseßhaften Gruppen. Man kann wohl noch hinzufügen, daß die Vorstellung eines "enclosed nomadism" für Palästina aus geographischen und ökologischen Gründen nicht zutrifft.

⁽¹²⁾ In diesem Zusammenhang diskutiert A. auch das Vorkommen von ššw jhw³ und ššw s'rr, bestreitet den Zusammenhang des letzteren Namens mit dem atl. Seir ("where did the second r go?") und setzt das Territorium dieser ššw in Syrien an (277, Anm. 5). Da aber Doppelkonsonanz in der Wiedergabe palästinischer Namen zumindest nicht ganz ungewöhnlich ist (vgl. škmm = škm), sollte man doch wohl besser bei Seir und dem edomitischen Bereich bleiben. Vgl. J. LECLANT, *Les fouilles de Soleb (Nubie Soudanaise)* (NAWG.PH 13; Göttingen 1965); S. HERRMANN, "Der alttestamentliche Gottesname" (1966), *Gesammelte Studien zur Geschichte und Theologie des Alten Testaments* (TBü 75; München 1986) 76-88.

central hill country in the period around and after 1200 BCE, which was a period when several new settlements were built. Thus, these Shasu, together with everybody else who lived in the hills, later became what is known as Israelites" (277). Eine andere Wurzel ist kanaanäisch. So schließt A. aus Papyrus Anastasi I, daß die Asseriten eine ursprünglich kanaanäische Gruppe waren, die später nominell Israeliten wurden. Gegen Ende der SpBr II begann die Wiederbesiedlung des zentralen Berglandes. Einige Gruppen wanderten vom Westen her dort ein und bildeten die Sippen von Ephraim und Benjamin. Dan, Gad und Naphtali waren wohl auch kanaanäischer Herkunft und wurden erst von David in Israel einbezogen.

Die "Israel"-Stele Merenptahs kann nach A. keinen Zusammenhang Israels mit Exodus und Einwanderung in Kanaan bestätigen. Man kann höchstens annehmen, daß einige aus Ägypten gekommene Semiten sich im Gebirgsland angesiedelt hätten. Ansonsten aber gilt: "The Israelites of the Merneptah stela were indigenous Canaanites fighting the Egyptian army" (286). Andererseits rechnet A. — ohne den Begriff "aramäische Wanderung" zu bemühen — mit weiträumigen Bevölkerungsbewegungen, so etwa der Hethiter und der Aramäer. Eine Neubesiedlung und Rekultivierung des zentralen Berglandes und Transjordanien führte zur Bildung neuer Nationen: Israels, Ammons, Moabs und Edoms. Zur Erklärung der Entstehung Israels verwendet A. also eine Kombination der Evolutions- und der Immigrationsthese: Israel bestand aus einer Mischbevölkerung mit einer wohl überwiegend einheimischen und einer geringeren nomadischen Komponente. Dies kommt der Wahrheit sicher näher als eine reine Evolutionserklärung, auch wenn man über die Gewichtung der Bestandteile mit A. streiten mag, besonders dann, wenn man seine radikale Ausschaltung der atl. Frühgeschichtstraditionen nicht teilt.

Ein Zusammenbruch des ökonomischen Systems im östlichen Mittelmeerraum bewirkte die Wanderung der Seevölker, die nicht ausschließlich kriegerisch, sondern auch friedlich verlief. Die Ansiedlung der Philister dürfte — wie nicht selten angenommen wird — auf Veranlassung der Ägypter erfolgt sein, und die Philister übernahmen auch den ägyptischen Herrschaftsanspruch. Im übrigen kann weder die Streuung der sog. Philisterkeramik noch das Vorkommen anthropoider Sarkophage sichere Auskünfte über die Verbreitung der Philister geben⁽¹³⁾.

IV

Nach A. setzt die E-Zeit hauptsächlich die SpBr fort. Die angeblich auf eine neue Kulturstufe oder gar neue Bevölkerungselemente verweisenden Phänomene tragen die Beweislast nicht. So ist das oft bemühte Vierraumhaus keine Neuerfindung oder eine israelitische Innovation, sondern die Weiter-

⁽¹³⁾ An dieser Stelle erörtert A. auch die sog. Debora-Schlacht von Ri 4-5. Einen großen Kampf zwischen einer kanaanäischen Koalition und einem Stämmebündnis hält er für "unrealistic" (325). Nach Ri 4,6.10; 5,18 hätten nur Sebulon und Naphtali gegen Sisera und seine Armee gekämpft. Ist es aber wirklich geboten, 5,18 derart aus seinem Kontext auszugrenzen?

entwicklung einer bronzezeitlichen Tradition⁽¹⁴⁾. Wohngruben und schlecht gebaute Hütten sagen nichts über die ethnische Zugehörigkeit ihrer Erbauer aus (aber vielleicht doch etwas über ihre frühere Lebensweise, der Rez.). Das explosionsartige Anwachsen der Siedlungen im Landesinnern im 12. und 11. Jh.⁽¹⁵⁾ kann nicht allein mit einer innerkanaanäischen Bewegung erklärt werden, obwohl die materielle Kultur in den neuen Siedlungen hauptsächlich kanaanäisch ist. Auch andere Gruppen unterschiedlicher Herkunft (Banditen, Flüchtlinge, Einwanderer aus dem Norden, Gruppen aus Ägypten, sesshaft werdende Nomaden, aber keine eindringenden, nomadischen Israeliten) strömten in das zentrale Bergland ein. Aus ihnen allen bildete sich Israel.

Die "Richter" waren Kleinkönige, und ihr Rang war z.T. wohl auch vererbbar. Von einer "premonarchic period" sollte man also nicht mehr sprechen (373), und auch die Theorien über die unterschiedlichen Phänomene der "großen" und "kleinen" Richter sollten fallengelassen werden. In dieses Bild werden auch Eli und Samuel eingezeichnet. Beide waren Regionalherrscher (in Silo bzw. in Rama). Samuel, der über ein sehr kleines Gebiet verfügte, mußte einer aufkommenden Größe weichen: Saul.

Von seiner Machtbasis, der gibeonitischen Föderation(!), aus gelang es Saul, die Philister zu vertreiben und das zentrale Bergland unter seiner Regierung zu einen und später auch die Amalekiter und die Ammoniter abzuwehren. Seine Herrschaft dauerte 22 oder gar 32 Jahre und ist mit dem Begriff "Heerkönigtum" unzutreffend beschrieben, denn Saul schuf nicht nur eine Söldnertruppe, sondern auch eine effiziente Administration. Beim Versuch einer Expansion nach Norden wurde er von den Philistern getötet. Es ist immerhin erstaunlich, wie vieles aus der Saul-Tradition der sonst so skeptische A. als historisch gelten läßt.

Die Darstellung der Herrschaft Davids und Salomos entfernt sich wenig von den geläufigen Pfaden. Seiner Herkunft nach war David "an indigenous Canaanite (-Calebite) from the hills of Judah" (456). Er startete seine Karriere als Söldner Sauls. Seine Herrschaft über Juda in Hebron mag schon vor dem Tod Sauls begonnen haben. Juda wird überhaupt erst jetzt zu einem nationalen Begriff. Einen Stamm Juda hatte es vorher nicht gegeben. Nach der Erhebung Davids zum König über Nordisrael und nach der teils gewaltsamen, teils friedlichen Übernahme der kanaanäischen Stadtstaaten wurden die Bewohner des Landes zu "Israeliten", und Jahwe (-El) wurde ihr Reichsgott. Die Siege Davids, besonders über die Aramäer, legen es nahe, daß er selbst über eine Streitwagenmacht verfügte (wodurch freilich 2 Sam 8,4 zum Rätsel wird). Das Großreich Davids beurteilt A. ganz zutreffend als "a parenthesis in the history of the ancient Near East" (487). Die Bevorzugung Judas und die Behandlung Nordisraels wie einen Vasallenstaat durch David nach dem Scheba-Aufstand legten den Keim zum späteren Zerfall.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Dazu vgl. die andersartige Beurteilung der Sachlage bei WEIPPERT, *Palästina*, 393-401, mit der sich A. nicht mehr auseinandersetzen konnte.

⁽¹⁵⁾ So immer (und zutreffend) im Text. Ist es ein Fehlgriff, daß die Überschrift des Kapitels "The Increase in Settlements During the Thirteenth and Twelfth Centuries BCE" lautet, oder soll sie A.s Meinung ausdrücken, daß dieser Prozeß schon im 13. Jh. anlief?

Auch in Salomos Verwaltungssystem war Juda exemt. Die ganze Einrichtung, die schon auf David zurückging, war von Ägypten inspiriert. Die Einteilung in Distrikte hatte nichts mit der Stämmeorganisation zu tun, "a phenomenon that probably never existed in his (sc. Solomon's) time or before" (514). Der Bau des Tempels stärkte den Einfluß der "Jerusalem Ideologie". Der am Tempel gepflegte Kult war synkretistisch; neben Jahwe wurden Baal, Aschera und die gesamte Götterversammlung verehrt. Den Terminus "salomonische Aufklärung" lehnt A. ab, meint aber doch, "that with David and Solomon the Near Eastern culture of the Levant broke the isolation of the mountain peoples of central Palestine" (538). Auch wenn Salomos Weisheit und Reichtum in den Quellen übertrieben dargestellt werden, muß man annehmen, daß seine Bedeutung in der Überlieferung zugunsten seines Vaters David herabgemindert wurde. Nach seinem Tod fiel das Reich auseinander.

V

Der erste Eingriff aus der Umwelt, der die beiden Kleinstaaten Israel und Juda traf, war der Einfall Schoschenks. Er kostete Juda — wenigstens zeitweise — die Hälfte seines Territoriums (Negev, West-Edom). Zur Konsequenz des Feldzuges meint A.: "Shoshenq's campaign in Palestine seems to have helped Jeroboam to keep Israel independent and stopped Rehoboam from rebuilding the Solomonic Kingdom" (556). Das ist die vorsichtige Wiederaufnahme einer älteren These⁽¹⁶⁾, die sich mit den Angaben der Schoschenkliste nur schwer vermitteln läßt. Nach dem Abzug Schoschenks bauten beide Staaten ihr Verteidigungssystem aus. Es ist interessant, daß A. in diesem Zusammenhang die Errichtung der ersten Ställe (oder Vorrathäuser oder Kasernen) und des Wassersystems in Megiddo Jerobeam I. zuschreibt. Die Annahme eines "charismatischen" Prinzips im Nordreich im Gegensatz zu einem "dynastischen" in Juda (A. Alt) lehnt er als "modern theological interpretation" (562) ab und dürfte damit im Recht sein. Weniger wahrscheinlich ist, daß als Folge der Invasion Benhadads (1 Kön 15,20) Galiläa und das nördliche Transjordanien für einige Zeit unter aramäische Herrschaft gerieten.

Omri wird als "rebuilder of the state of Israel" (574) hoch bewertet. Hingegen soll Ahab an der Koalition von 853 v.Chr. gegen die Assyrer evtl. als Vasall von Damaskus teilgenommen haben. Die Elia-Elisa-Geschichten beziehen sich nach A. überwiegend auf die Zeit nach Ahab. Für Elisa ist das m.E. eindeutig, für Elia nicht. Zum Streiter für den "reinen" Jahweglauben wurde Elia erst durch spätere Verfasser, denn eine solche Vorstellung paßt nicht zur Religion der Omridenzeit. Auch dahinter sollte man starke Fragezeichen setzen. Der rätselhafte Feldzug der Könige von Israel, Juda und Edom gegen Moab wird mehrfach, aber keineswegs widerspruchsfrei erörtert (579, 588-589, 598)⁽¹⁷⁾. Unklar ist auch die Diskussion

⁽¹⁶⁾ Vgl. T.H. ROBINSON, *A History of Israel I* (Oxford 1932, ND 1948) 275.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Einmal ist Josafat (589), einmal Joram (598) der beteiligte jüdische König.

über die historischen Umstände des Kampfes zwischen Joram von Israel und Hasael von Damaskus (592-594, 639). Worauf sich die Annahme eines Krieges Hasaels gegen Moab gründet (605), ist nicht ersichtlich. Hasael versuchte jedenfalls, ein neues Großreich zu errichten, und Israel und Juda wurden vorübergehend zu Vasallenstaaten von Damaskus. Für die religiöse Situation des 9. und 8. Jhs. bieten die atl. Texte nichts Vertrauenswürdiges. Die archäologischen Befunde zeigen, "that the religious scene was quite different from that presented in the Bible" (615). Auch die Prophetentexte sind keine Ausnahme: "Prophets were usually religious fanatics and cultural reactionaries, and so their evaluations are of dubious value in a historiographic reconstruction of the past" (620). Die Worte des Amos wurden in der vorliegenden Form in nachexilischer Zeit fixiert, und die Gestalt des Propheten diente als Sprachrohr für "the late pure-Yahwistic ideology" (621). Durch solche Pauschalurteile beraubt sich A. nicht nur wichtigen Quellenmaterials, sondern verzeichnet auch das Phänomen der Prophetie.

Eine chronologisch nicht sonderlich klare Darstellung führt vom Regierungsantritt Tiglatpileasers III. bis zum Fall von Damaskus (732 v.Chr.). Nach einem Abschnitt über die Geschehnisse der transjordanischen Staaten im 8. und 7. Jh. wird die Geschichte der assyrischen Zeit weiterverfolgt. Den König "So" von Ägypten identifiziert A. mit Osorkon IV., was wohl chronologische Schwierigkeiten aufwirft. Den für die Lage in Nordisrael nach dem Fall Samarias wichtigen Text 2 Kön 17,24-41 beurteilt A. als eine späte, polemische Passage ohne Geschichtswert für die Zeit nach 722⁽¹⁸⁾. Auch hier wäre eine differenzierte Analyse der einzelnen Überlieferungen wünschenswert. Die Politik des Königs Ahas von Juda war nach A. vernünftig und der Situation angemessen, jedoch sei sein Bild durch die Überlieferungen von Jesaja verdunkelt, dessen unrealistische Ratschläge der König nicht befolgte. Zur sog. Reform Hiskias wiederholt A. seine Auffassung⁽¹⁹⁾, daß Hiskia die Kultobjekte, Idole und Priester aus den Landheiligtümern nach Jerusalem verbringen ließ, um sie nicht in die Hände der Assyrier fallen zu lassen und die Heiligkeit der Hauptstadt zu stärken. Unter den verschiedenen Erklärungen für die Gründe des Abzugs Sannheribs von Jerusalem im Jahre 701 bevorzugt A. die auf Herodot zurückgehende Tradition von der Mäuseplage, der das Leder der Waffen zum Opfer fiel⁽²⁰⁾. Der einschneidende Territorialverlust, den Juda 701 erlitt — zudem drängten die Edomiter in den Negev, dessen nördlicher Teil unter die Kontrolle von Gaza geriet —, wurde erst unter Manasse wieder rückgängig gemacht. Assurbanipal gab ihm die Gebiete zurück, um Juda in ein Bollwerk gegen Ägypten einzubinden, eine ganz plausible Vorstellung.

Wenig stimmig ist die Darstellung der Regierung Josias. Anfangs scheint es so, als sei Josia von vornherein ein Vasall Ägyptens gewesen, der gar nicht die Möglichkeit hatte, nach Norden zu expandieren (764), dann

⁽¹⁸⁾ Mit E. WÜTHWEIN, *Die Bücher der Könige. 1. Kön. 17 - 2. Kön. 25* (ATD 11,2; Göttingen 1984) 397-403.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Vgl. *Royal Administration*, 66.

⁽²⁰⁾ "It was sheer luck that Hezekiah survived the war — thanks probably to a horde of mice" (716).

wird aber mit einer Allianz gerechnet, die doch eine Invasion in Samaria erlaubte (779). Auf alle Fälle ging es um ein begrenztes Gebiet, das Bethel einschloß. Den Bericht über den Fund des Gesetzbuches beurteilt A. als fiktiv, das Dokument selbst als Erzeugnis der königlichen Kanzlei, die Reform schließlich als "a 'realignment' with a new political situation" (778). Damit wird ein zukunftsbestimmendes Ereignis allzu sehr unterschätzt.

Die babylonische Herrschaft führte relativ rasch zum Untergang Judas und der ostjordanischen Vasallenstaaten. In dem Feldzug Nebukadnezars von 582/1, dem Ammon und Moab zum Opfer fielen, vermutet A. eine Strafexpedition wegen des Mordes an Gedalja. Dann müßte letzterer länger als Statthalter gewirkt haben, als es die atl. Überlieferung erkennen läßt. Edom verlor seine Selbständigkeit erst unter Nabonid. In dieser Zeit begann auch die Expansion der Phönizier nach Süden, die zur Übernahme der philistäischen Städte führte.

VI

Die ca. 200 Jahre der Perserherrschaft kommen am Schluß des Buches verhältnismäßig kurz zur Sprache. Daß Esr 1,2-4 angeblich nichts von einer Rückkehr der Deportierten sagt, ist angesichts des Textes unverständlich. Das Urteil ist für 6,3-5 berechtigt, aber das Verhältnis beider Versionen des Kyros-Edikts wird nicht diskutiert (vgl. aber die kurze Bemerkung 835, Anm. 3). Der Status von Juda zu Beginn der Perserzeit war der einer Sub-Provinz, und dies scheint schon auf die babylonische Administration zurückzugehen. Scheschbazar war wohl ein Babylonier, der mit der Rückführung der Tempelgeräte beauftragt war. Erst mit Serubbabel griff der persische Hof auf einen Angehörigen des judäischen Königsgeschlechts zurück.

Das zeitliche Verhältnis zwischen Esra und Nehemia entscheidet A. dahingehend, daß Nehemia vor Esra gewirkt haben muß, in der Zeit Artaxerxes' I., während Esra unter Artaxerxes II. entsandt wurde. Die hierfür vorgebrachten Argumente sind einsichtig. Esra hatte die Aufgabe, die propersische Stimmung im Land zu fördern. Dafür war er durch seine judäische Herkunft und seine Erziehung im persischen Denken über Religion und Religionsgesetze besonders geeignet. Das Gesetz Esras ist in Babylonien entstanden und vom Hof autorisiert worden. In Juda war es noch nicht bekannt. Mit Esras Reform bekam "Israel" eine neue Bedeutung; es wurde "purely a religious idea" (886). Erst jetzt wurde der "reine" Jahwismus geschaffen: "Only with Ezra did this type of reformed Yahwistic religion actually become an empirical reality" (887). Von dieser Ansetzung her wird es noch einmal höchst fraglich, ob man so viele Teile des AT als Rückprojektionen des nachexilischen "reinen" Jahwismus in die Frühzeit beurteilen kann, wie A. dies tut.

Das Datum des samaritanischen Schismas ist nach A. nicht mehr genau feststellbar. Vielleicht trat der Bruch zwischen Garizim und Jerusalem erst dann definitiv ein, als Johannes Hyrkanos den samaritanischen Tempel zerstörte. Damit blickt die Darstellung aber schon über ihre Grenze hinaus,

die sie mit dem Einfall Alexanders und der makedonischen Eroberung Palästinas erreicht.

Das Buch enthält mehrere Indices, 24 Kartenskizzen und 8 Fotos. Auch wenn man sich — wie der Rez. — bei der Lektüre oft zu Zweifeln und Widersprüchen herausgefordert sieht, wird man dem Alterswerk eines kenntnisreichen und originellen Gelehrten seinen Respekt nicht versagen können.

Hans-Böckler-Str. 18
D-44787 Bochum

Winfried THIEL

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

Rainer KESSLER, *Staat und Gesellschaft im vorexilischen Juda. Vom 8. Jahrhundert bis zum Exil* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 47). Leiden – New York – Köln, E.J. Brill, 1992. xi-246 p. 16 × 24,5. Dfl 140,—; \$80.00

En este trabajo de habilitación, realizado bajo la dirección de Frank Crüsemann y ligeramente reelaborado para su publicación, se plantea el autor las relaciones entre sociedad y estado en el antiguo Israel. Su pregunta inicial es ésta: el hecho de que la sociedad cambie, ¿afecta o no afecta al estado? Si lo afecta, ¿en qué se nota? Estas preguntas, según Kessler, nunca han sido tratadas metódicamente. Se habla mucho del cambio social a que se vio sometido el antiguo Israel, pero no de cómo ese cambio marcó al estado.

Con este punto de partida, la obra se estructura en cuatro capítulos (numerados del 0 al 3), de dimensiones muy desiguales: Introducción (1-21), la crítica social de los profetas (22-131), el restante material veterotestamentario y epigráfico (132-219), conclusión (220-223). Una bibliografía, índice de autores y de citas bíblicas cierran la obra (224-246).

El capítulo 0 nos introduce en la problemática a través de la historia de la investigación. Punto de partida inevitable es la teoría de Alt sobre la responsabilidad de los funcionarios cananeos en la injusticia social en Israel. Donner recoge y desarrolla esta idea indicando que esos funcionarios cananeos provocan la injusticia y se benefician de ella gracias a que manipulan la administración de la justicia. Pero Rüterswörden se opone a esta interpretación de Alt-Donner: el profundo cambio del siglo VIII no se puede relacionar con los reyes y los funcionarios, sino que representa un fenómeno totalmente nuevo. Para describir esta evolución se ha acudido a dos modelos: el «capitalismo de rentas» (Loretz, Lang) y «la antigua sociedad de clases» (Kippenberg). El capitalismo de rentas niega que este fenómeno sea típico de Israel; al contrario, para comprender las injusticias que denuncian los profetas hay que conocer el modo de actuación económica común al antiguo Oriente. El modelo propuesto por Kippenberg piensa que la evolución experimentada por Israel debemos relacionarla más bien con la de Grecia e Italia. Teniendo en cuenta estas investigaciones, K. afirma que las relaciones entre el estado y la sociedad en el Judá preexílico tienen dos caras: 1) saber si en el siglo VIII tuvo lugar el paso de un orden social y económico antiguo a uno nuevo; 2) conocer el puesto del estado y su influjo en el desarrollo social. Su campo de estudio lo limita en el espacio (Judá) y en el tiempo (la época preexílica).

El capítulo 1 se centra en la crítica social de los profetas (Isaías, Miqueas, Sofonías, Jeremías, Habacuc, Ezequiel), aunque limitándose a los textos que aportan algo al problema de estado y sociedad. En cada caso, al análisis de los textos sigue un balance del profeta. El resultado final abarca los dos temas que interesan al autor: la evolución social y el papel del estado.

Lo que aportan los textos proféticos a la evolución social de Judá se resume en los siguientes puntos: 1) los profetas nos dejan ver el paso de una sociedad relativamente igualitaria a una sociedad de clases; 2) los responsables de este cambio son no sólo los funcionarios (como pretenden Alt-Donner) sino también los ricos, latifundistas, etc.; es decir, una clase alta compuesta por gente económicamente fuerte y por gente poderosa políticamente; 3) frente a esa clase alta se encuentran sus víctimas: pobres, débiles, indigentes; 4) la división de la sociedad en gente económicamente fuerte y gente económicamente débil tiene consecuencias incluso en el vocabulario: *'am h-a'āreš* se convierte a partir del siglo VIII en designación de los ricos, mientras los profetas aplican «pueblo» a los pobres; 5) al hablar de los medios que han favorecido esta división de la sociedad en ricos y pobres, lo primero que se advierte es que los textos proféticos no mencionan la manipulación del derecho en este contexto; cuando hablan del tema, no reprochan este pecado a los ricos sino a los funcionarios y jueces; Jeremías y Habacuc atribuyen el fenómeno al abuso del poder. Por consiguiente, la causa no debemos buscarla en este terreno (contra Donner), sino en el puramente económico, especialmente en el fenómeno del préstamo y del endeudamiento, que condiciona toda la dinámica de la evolución de Judá a partir del último tercio del siglo VIII; 6) los textos proféticos demuestran que no se trata de «circunstancias comunes a todo el antiguo Oriente» (como pretende la teoría del capitalismo de rentas), sino de un cambio profundo de la sociedad, que se caracteriza por la acumulación de bienes por parte de unos y el endeudamiento por parte de otros.

En cuanto al papel del estado, los profetas se fijan en tres aspectos: 1) La preocupación por el derecho, que no es una *iustitia distributiva*, sino una *iustitia adiutrix miseri*; los textos proféticos demuestran un fallo radical en este tema, porque quienes tienen el poder político y social tienen también poder sobre el derecho. 2) La crítica al lujo del rey y de la corte. 3) Las obras propias del estado (construcciones, guerra), que repercuten en el trabajo forzado y suponen un abuso de poder, del que son víctima especialmente los débiles.

Todo esto plantea tres problemas: 1) ¿Qué relación existe entre los diversos elementos de esta clase alta? 2) ¿Qué presupuestos permiten que se dé la corrupción de los funcionarios? 3) Además de las obras de construcción y de las guerras, ¿qué otras actividades del estado judío podemos conocer y cómo influyen en la evolución social? Estas tres preguntas, en orden inverso, las trata en el capítulo 2, utilizando otros materiales veterotestamentarios (historia deuteronomista y salmos reales) y epigráficos.

En cuanto a los campos de actividad del estado analiza: lo referente al ejército, su organización y sus oficiales; los tributos y el cuidado de las fortalezas; los trabajos forzosos. Estos datos nos permiten advertir que Judá,

en los cuatrocientos años de su existencia, pasa de ser un «estado temprano» (early state) a un «estado maduro». El estado ha cambiado en su función. En los comienzos de la monarquía se constata un claro distanciamiento entre el rey y el pueblo (ver 1 Sam 8,11-17), cosa típica de los «estados tempranos». Siglos más tarde, como advertimos por los profetas, el pueblo se ha dividido en ricos y pobres, y el estado se encuentra ante dos clases distintas. Con ello, su función cambia totalmente por lo que respeta a las actividades propias del estado. El trabajo forzoso ya no afecta de igual medida a todo el pueblo, sino que grava especialmente sobre el sector pobre de la sociedad. Por otra parte, la clase alta de la sociedad se vincula al aparato del estado (los hijos de los terratenientes aparecen como jefes del ejército).

Este cambio de función del estado se puede describir con el modelo estudiado por Claessen y Skalník a propósito del estado temprano. En el paso al estado maduro distinguen tres etapas, que también podemos detectar en nuestro caso. Judá ha pasado desde un «inchoate early state» (en tiempos de Saúl y comienzos del reinado de David) a un «typical early state» (David) y luego al «transitional early state». Esta tercera etapa es la más importante para nuestro estudio, porque supone el antagonismo de clases y la dicotomía entre dominadores y dominados. El resultado es que las actividades del estado, como indicamos anteriormente, repercuten de manera distinta sobre las dos clases de la sociedad.

A continuación estudia la jerarquía del estado: el rey, la corte, los funcionarios, fijándose especialmente en esos últimos, ya que a ellos se dirige sobre todo la crítica profética. A mi gusto, esta es la parte más interesante y novedosa del estudio, pero resulta imposible resumir en poco espacio los datos que ofrece.

Por último, dentro de esta segunda parte, estudia las relaciones entre la «Casa de David», los funcionarios y la aristocracia campesina. El análisis de los datos demuestra que Judá es una «monarquía participativa» (ya que el poder del rey está limitado por el de sus funcionarios y el del *‘am hā’āreš*), pero no todo el pueblo participa igualmente del poder. Mientras al rey y la corte le interesan el apoyo de la aristocracia campesina (que fomenta mediante matrimonios y otros recursos). o de los funcionarios (a los que nombra para sus cargos), la gente humilde pasa totalmente desapercibida, no participa nada en la marcha del país. En resumen, la simple oposición que se daba en el «estado temprano» entre el rey y el pueblo desaparece durante el paso al «estado maduro». En esta etapa, el pueblo se divide en dos partes: una que crece (formada por la aristocracia de los funcionarios y la aristocracia campesina) y otra que mengua (el pueblo sencillo y pobre). La primera participa del poder del rey. La segunda queda excluida de ese poder.

¿No podía hacer nada el monarca para mejorar esta situación? Advertimos dos intentos en este sentido, durante los reinados de Josías (con su reforma, que implica aspectos sociales) y de Sedecías (con la liberación de esclavos). Pero el rey no puede dictar leyes. Por otra parte, el poder del estado no está exclusivamente en manos del monarca. Ese poder lo comparte con funcionarios y terratenientes, que se oponen a reformas radicales.

El final del estudio, muy breve (c.3), sugiere que la solución a todos estos problemas se encuentra en el Deuteronomio, donde se concede importancia a temas capitales como el endeudamiento, la corrupción en la administración de la justicia y el abuso del poder por parte del estado. Pero ni siquiera el Deuteronomio consiguió impedir la catástrofe, porque los intereses económicos, sociales y políticos de los grupos integrantes del estado se oponían a él.

Entre los aspectos positivos de este estudio destacaría los siguientes. 1) El tema, como indica K. al comienzo, no ha sido tratado sistemáticamente hasta ahora. En este sentido, su trabajo supone una aportación nueva e interesante. Después de haber dedicado años a estudiar estas cuestiones reconozco que he aprendido mucho leyendo su obra. Especialmente por lo que respecta a los funcionarios y su relación con la corona. K. sistematiza cosas que a veces no hemos relacionado de forma orgánica. 2) La exposición y el lenguaje son claros, haciendo muy agradable la lectura de la obra, aunque el método de división decimal no sea siempre de ayuda.

Precisamente por lo anterior, la obra es asequible a cualquier persona interesada en el tema. Pero al lector no especialista conviene advertirle que la traducción e interpretación de los textos proféticos no es tan sencilla como puede sugerir la primera parte de este libro. K. omite esta clase de problemas, aceptando sin mayor discusión determinadas propuestas. Esta cierta superficialidad en el tratamiento de algunos temas se advierte también cuando habla de 1 Sam 8,11-17, texto al que concede mucha importancia para su teoría sobre la contraposición inicial entre el rey y todo el pueblo; sin grandes angustias de conciencia admite que el texto es antiguo y sirve para describir la situación social de aquella época; esto resulta muy discutible y debería haber sido tratado más a fondo. Dígase lo mismo del comentario a la fórmula «practicar la justicia y el derecho», que interpreta con el Sl 72. Indudablemente, en su origen la fórmula podía reflejar ese idea; en la práctica, la frecuencia con que usan esta fórmula los reyes de los pueblos vecinos demuestra que es pura propaganda vacía de contenido; «practicar la justicia y el derecho» no significa más que «reinar».

A pesar de estas pequeñas discrepancias, valoro positivamente el trabajo de Kessler y creo que el especialista se enriquecerá con su lectura (especialmente de la segunda parte).

Aptdo. 2002
E-18080 Granada
España

José L. SICRE

Horacio SIMIAN-YOFRE, *El desierto de los dioses*. Teología e Historia en el libro de Oseas. Córdoba, Ediciones El Almendro, 1993, 286 p. 23 × 15

L'autore, impegnato da tempo a studiare il profeta Osea, ha pubblicato questo libro con un intento ben preciso: offrire agli studenti di Sacra Scrittura e di Teologia in generale una chiave di lettura «rigorosamente» fondata e didattica per cogliere le ricchezze racchiuse nel testo di Osea. Le prime 15 pagine, oltre al titolo e ai riferimenti editoriali, contengono il piano dell'opera e i ringraziamenti.

In tre paginette (17-19) è condensata una interessante prefazione, necessaria per la comprensione dell'opera. Il corpus è racchiuso in 232 pagine (21-253). In un'appendice di otto pagine (255-263), l'A. offre al lettore la sua sintesi sulla storia della composizione del testo di Osea. Una bibliografia scelta (265-277) e tre indici [temi e nomi biblici (279-280); autori citati (281-283); vocaboli ebraici (285-286)] concludono l'opera. Il corpus centrale è suddiviso in due sezioni: nella prima sono trattate le unità testuali, in 155 pagine (21-176), e nella seconda, di 76 pagine (177-253), si evidenziano le ricchezze teologiche, storiche e culturali racchiuse nelle unità studiate precedentemente. La differenza di 79 pagine fra la prima sezione e la seconda è giustificata dal fatto che nella prima, oltre al commento, viene offerta al lettore la traduzione del testo con le rispettive «osservazioni filologiche». L'autore, volutamente, continua nella seconda sezione la numerazione dei capitoli (V-VII), iniziata nella prima (I-IV), per indicare che le due parti sono strettamente collegate.

L'indagine su Os 1-3, nel cap. I e nel cap. V, si presenta come l'aspetto più originale dell'opera, per la distinzione dei livelli di lettura dell'esperienza personale del profeta, narrata nelle parti A (1,2-9), B (2,4-15), C (3,1-3) e una riflessione ulteriore, riportata in altre tre parti, A' (2,1-3), B' (2,16-25), C' (3,4-5), intercalate alle precedenti. In questa maniera l'autore cerca di risolvere l'annoso problema della interpretazione di Os 1-3. Non per nulla egli presenta la «herencia exegética» a mo' di introduzione alla sua esegesi. Inoltre, per rendere la sua argomentazione più convincente, si sente in dovere di offrire al lettore una succinta valutazione del concetto di allegoria e simbolo (43-46 e n.30), per fugare ogni interpretazione ristretta all'ambito simbolico-allegorico dei termini Osea-Gomer e YHWH-Israele. Anche visivamente, ci si accorge della diversa divisione del materiale di Os 1-3, rispetto ai capitoli II-IV.

Nel cap. II l'A. tenta di dimostrare, che, di fatto, sono i sacerdoti il vero oggetto delle severe critiche del profeta, mentre il popolo non sarebbe altro che una vittima, indirizzata verso un culto corrotto. Ai profeti e alla loro funzione non viene attribuito un gran peso. Lo stesso tema, centrato sul rapporto tra religione e politica, si ritrova nel cap. III (111-145): i sacerdoti e i capi, più che il popolo, sono il vero oggetto di condanna. In più viene qui criticato anche il culto ormai ridotto a riti svuotati di ogni contenuto. I delitti e le odiosità commesse a Gilgal e a Baal Peor sono il segno della corruzione sempre più profonda. Nel cap. IV (147-176) l'autore mette in luce il rapporto personale e misterioso tra YHWH e Israele. Con la rievocazione

negativa della figura di Giacobbe, Osea voleva affermare che Israele si era mostrato indegno dell'alleanza fin dall'inizio. Al rifiuto, ormai quasi definitivo, segue tuttavia una rinnovata promessa di Dio. La finale (14,10) è riferita a un saggio che ha compreso, all'interno della profezia di Osea, il contrasto fra YHWH che ama e conosce Israele e Israele che, al contrario, misconosce YHWH. Nell'espressione *pōšē'im yikkāš'elū bām* il saggio sintetizzerebbe i colpevoli accusati dal profeta.

Il cap. V apre la seconda sezione che, come è stato già detto, costituisce insieme al cap. I, l'aspetto più originale di questo studio. L'A. indica una chiave di lettura di Os 1-3 a diversi livelli: biografico, teologico, storico e mitico-religioso. Leggendo fra le righe, egli arriva a descrivere la sofferta esperienza vitale e i sentimenti di Osea e di Gomer. Il profeta, sospinto verso una religione più luminosa, si allontana dalla società «farisaica», per comprendere la misericordia e la necessità di convertirsi. Osea avrebbe visto scorrere sotto gli occhi gli anni oscuri del regno della «casa di Jehu» e i misfatti commessi contro i servi di YHWH. Secondo l'A. le categorie di deserto, fertilità, sessualità, incontro uomo-donna, risentono anche degli archetipi mitico-culturali cananei, a cui risale, tra l'altro, il titolo del presente volume. Il concetto di deserto in Osea non è riferito all'Esodo, ma è visto come il luogo inospitale, dimora fascinosa di YHWH, ambiente sacro, puro, dove avviene l'incontro con il trascendente per mezzo di una promessa metastorica. La sessualità e la fertilità, da doni indipendenti e misteriosi dei baalim, accessibili attraverso riti degenerati, diventano doni di YHWH che illuminano l'uomo nella sua autentica chiamata alla relazione con gli altri e con l'universo.

Il cap. VI (205-228), suddiviso in quattro paragrafi, riprende e approfondisce i temi trattati nei capitoli II e III, indagando sul concetto di «idolo», non riferito qui al significato generale teologico e religioso, ma a due precise realtà: il toro e i baalim. Nel cap. VII (229-253), suddiviso anch'esso in quattro paragrafi, l'autore cerca di presentare la ricchezza delle immagini di Dio nel testo di Osea. Da notare è la traduzione della *hesed* di YHWH con «magnanimità», perché è un termine, oggi, non ancora banalizzato. Nel quarto paragrafo, egli propone l'immagine di YHWH nella storia e ritiene di dover affermare che l'intento di Osea è quello di laicizzare l'interpretazione della società e dei giochi di potere e di comprendere razionalmente la storia. L'autentica immagine di YHWH gli ha permesso di superare e di purificare una religiosità ancora impastata con elementi mitici e culturali arcaici.

Nell'appendice, l'A. propone ai lettori una soluzione della problematica riferita alla storia del libro di Osea. In un primo paragrafo è trattata la questione della presenza del vocabolo *yēhūdā*. Delle 15 attestazioni solo otto dovrebbero appartenere al testo «originale», mentre le altre sette rivelerebbero una redazione «judaíta» (1,1.7; 4,15; 5,5; 6,11a; 8,14; 12,3). Osea avrebbe menzionato Giuda per esprimere la sua visione della storia, che riguarda il popolo unito, mentre la redazione «judaíta» sarebbe una riflessione sulla situazione contemporanea di Giuda, dopo la caduta del regno del Nord, perché, scoprendosi simile a Efraim non finisca come lui. A questo punto, in due pagine (261-263), dopo aver cercato nel corso dell'esposi-

zione di recuperare le unità testuali, dimostrando che non è necessario vivisezionare il testo per poterlo interpretare, l'A. riassume il suo pensiero sulla storia della composizione:

- i capitoli 1-3 [a parte 1,1.7; 2,1-3.16-25; 3,5] sarebbero stati scritti dal profeta stesso;
- le parole del profeta, pronunciate nel periodo che va dalla fine del regno di Geroboamo II all'inizio di quello di Menahem e raccolte per iscritto nei capitoli 4-13 dagli ascoltatori, formano un testo-base coerente, in cui è rispettato lo stile stesso di Osea;
- 13,1-9 è da attribuire alla mano di un epigono fedele al ricordo del profeta;
- alla redazione «judaíta» il nostro autore aggiungerebbe anche 4,16-19; 11,10-11. Dopo la caduta di Samaria, il testo sarebbe stato portato a Gerusalemme, dove sarebbero state aggiunte le riflessioni riguardanti Giuda.
- 14,2-10 è da considerare come un vero epilogo al libro di Osea.

L'autore, pienamente cosciente delle difficoltà che presenta il testo di Osea ci tiene a chiarire, nella prefazione, i limiti di questo suo scritto, che dovrebbe risultare una via di mezzo fra «commentario» e «monografia», rispettando alcune caratteristiche tipiche dell'uno e dell'altra, come la trattazione del testo nella sua completezza e l'approfondimento di aspetti particolari. Questa scelta costringe l'A. a muoversi con molta attenzione, perché l'opera può facilmente degenerare in un ibridismo. Per questo motivo, egli predilige un approccio sincronico allo studio del testo, cercando di salvaguardare le unità letterarie e di dimostrare la coerenza «totale» del discorso esegetico, pur rilevando la peculiarità di ogni unità letteraria.

L'A. fa seguire quasi sempre ad ogni unità le «observaciones filológicas», strettamente necessarie per giustificare la lettura adottata e renderla accettabile. Mi sembra, comunque, che le «observaciones filológicas» non siano state usate adeguatamente, per il fatto che, in riferimento ad alcune unità testuali, sono o mancanti (cf. 36-37; 50; 63) o estremamente ridotte (cf. 66; 79; 84; 90; 100-101; 107; 121), mentre altri brani sono stati privilegiati (cf. 27-28; 75-76; 112-114; 128; 135; 148-149; 165-166; 169), quando si sa che quasi ogni versetto del TM fa problema. L'A. stesso, del resto, di fronte a una interpretazione poco convincente, si richiama a «una discutible traducción» (cf. per es. 144 n. 34) e rimanda ai commentari moderni chi volesse avere una visione più completa delle difficoltà testuali. Stranamente, il lavoro di P. G. Borbone, benché riportato nella bibliografia, non viene citato nemmeno una volta, come del resto è ignorato il lavoro di D. Barthélemy, almeno il V vol. del *Compte rendu préliminaire et provisoire sur le travail d'analyse textuelle de l'Ancien Testament hébreu* (New York 1980), (a meno che l'A. non abbia avuto la possibilità di avere a disposizione, per tempo, l'opera definitiva, pubblicata nel 1992 [OBO 50/3]). Inoltre non sempre le «observaciones» sono «filológicas», forse sarebbe stato più corretto chiamarle «annotazioni al testo», come l'A. fa in qualche caso (cf. 48; 172).

L'A. ha un interesse particolare per la comprensione delle immagini e del simbolismo, quantunque ritenga necessario uno studio proporzionato fra indagine semantica e interpretazione delle immagini, per poter cogliere il sottofondo culturale, storico e religioso di ogni singola unità. La ricerca di una coerenza «totale» del discorso esegetico, soprattutto per il libro di Osea, può risultare equivoca, perché, se è vero, da una parte, che un testo, per avere un senso, deve presentare un contenuto coerente, dall'altra diventa deleterio, quando la «coerenza» richiesta da una intuizione iniziale forza la scelta di una lettura rispetto ad un'altra contro l'evidenza di testimoni testuali, soltanto perché si ha un senso coerente con la tesi sostenuta.

Per es. (50-53) la traduzione adottata (v. 2c) di *'lh* come «crescere», rafforza, nella pericope, il significato di una «crescita» numerica di Israele e giustifica, in conformità col v. 1, la traduzione di Yzreel in «Dio semina», come l'Emmanuele di Isaia (7,14; 8,10). Se invece s'intende *'lh* (cf. Os 2,17: *'lh + mn + 'rs*) nel senso di «uscire da», allora Yzreel sarebbe un nome proprio (Israele?) e difficilmente potrebbe essere compreso nel suo senso etimologico. Del resto tradurre Yzreel con «Dio semina» anche nel v. 24b è alquanto forzato, malgrado la spiegazione data nelle p. 59-60 e n. 57. Infatti, si è obbligati a dare alle particelle *'et* significati diversi, mentre il senso più ovvio dell'espressione *'nh + 't* + cosa e *'nh + 't* + persona è la relazione espressa fra i beni che la terra produce per grazia di Dio e gli stessi che esaudiscono (i desideri, cioè saziano) Yzreel (Israele?).

Nelle p. 73-74 risulta poco convincente il commento alla traduzione «devorar el pecado» (*'kl h'f't*). L'espressione tipica (Lv 10,17.19; cf. anche Lv 4,1-5.13; 6,17-23) significa «mangiare (o no) la carne della vittima», offerta per il sacrificio del peccato. Una tale traduzione però lascerebbe molti dubbi sull'epoca «preesilica» del brano. Infatti ciò andrebbe contro l'assunto dell'A. che pone anche le parti «secondarie» in epoca preesilica.

A p. 77 l'A. inizia una interpretazione, che percorre quasi tutto il testo, fermamente ostile alla classe sacerdotale. Per questo la forma *Hi (hiznêta)* del v. 3b è stata compresa come transitivo-causativa: «has inducido a Efraim a prostituirse». È evidente che questa lettura è dettata dall'interesse di ridurre la responsabilità del popolo e penalizzare fortemente i sacerdoti, ma in questa maniera il testo viene, almeno un po', forzato. Tra l'altro ci si sarebbe aspettati una giustificazione nelle annotazioni al testo (cf. H. S. Nyberg, *Studien*, 37; T. Muraoka, «Hosea V in the Septuagint Version», *Abr-Nahrain* 27 (1986) 120-138; P. G. Borbone, *Il libro del profeta Osea*, 121,148; D. Barthélemy, *Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament* [OBO 50/3; 1992] 517-519). A conferma di ciò, nel v. 5a, la forma del TM *bepānāyw* viene letta come *bipnêhem*, variante non riportata da alcun testimonio testuale. L'A. ha voluto leggere «el orgullo de Israel ha testimoniado contra ellos» riferito ai sacerdoti (cf. 80; 81), mentre il testo ha «contro di lui» riferito a Israele, malgrado le spiegazioni riportate a p. 81. La stessa intenzione compare anche a p. 115 riferita a 8,1 che l'A. traduce «como un heraldo contra el templo de YHWH», al posto dell'immagine dell'aquila assira che piomba sulla «casa di YHWH», per accentuare nel brano l'influsso negativo dei sacerdoti, mentre il testo lascia intendere che si tratta del popolo. Non si capisce perché il pronome *hēm* (v. 4) debba essere misterioso

e riferito all'«alto clero y la nobleza militar», soprattutto poi se l'identificazione del pronome (116) è giustificata a partire dal testo 5,1-7, in cui abbiamo notato la forzatura in 5,5a. Del resto (118) anche 8,9 inizia con il pronome plurale *kî hēm̄mā*, e l'A. è costretto a riferirlo al popolo, anche se poi nelle righe 37-39 ripete che il brano 8,8-14, di fatto, condanna i sacerdoti come responsabili principali. A p. 123 riga 33 l'A. introduce «los sacerdotes (?)», anche se con un punto di domanda, ma il testo (9,1-9) parla di Efraim e di Israele. L'interesse dell'A. di sfumare la colpa del popolo, per accentuare la responsabilità dei capi è sintetizzato a p. 134 riga 12-20, quando afferma che dal cap. 4 al cap. 9,9 il popolo era stato menzionato marginalmente. Questi esempi non sono stati riportati per dimostrare che l'interpretazione dell'A. sia del tutto errata, ma per notare la forzatura fatta al testo, nel voler accentuare a tutti i costi un significato.

Di notevole interesse è l'indagine sugli archetipi, per penetrare ancor più in profondità nel pensiero di Osea, supposto che l'interpretazione dell'A., specialmente per i cap. 1-3, corrisponda alla realtà (per un'interpretazione diversa recente cf. W. D. Whitt, «The Divorce of Yahweh and Asherah in Hos 2,4-7.12 FF», *SJOT* 6 [1992] 31-67). Comunque la felice intuizione di leggere il testo di Osea servendosi di raggi di luce che provengono dalla teologia politica, dalla psicologia, dalla mitologia e dalla storia delle religioni ha rivelato una ricchezza nascosta fra le righe e merita ulteriori indagini. Per quanto riguarda l'interpretazione della storia (251-253), mi pare che l'A. applichi al pensiero di Osea una riflessione teologica che risente di tempi posteriori, come il superamento della vecchia concezione del rapporto automatico fra Dio e il suo popolo: alla fedeltà corrispondono benefici e alla infedeltà castighi.

Il libro di H. Simian-Yofre, coinvolgendo varie discipline, anche se non sempre in maniera ordinata, presenta una ricchezza di argomentazioni, che, a volte, sembrano provocatorie contro i «cultori positivisti» del libro biblico. Egli invece è capace di offrire una lettura calda, affascinante e piena di intuizioni, spaccando il ghiaccio della pura critica, per liberare i tesori nascosti nel testo a livello biografico, storico, teologico e archetipale, i quali, non di rado, sono raggiungibili solo con la fantasia creatrice. All'A. un vivo ringraziamento.

Via Dandolo, 58
00153 Roma

Innocenzo CARDELLINI

Giovanni GARBINI, *Cantico dei Cantici*. Testo, traduzione, note e commento di Giovanni Garbini (Biblica – Testi e Studi 2). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1992, 358 p. 16,5 × 23,5

Giovanni Garbini, ordinario di filologia semitica all'Università di Roma «La Sapienza», ha al suo attivo una vastissima produzione scientifica in campo epigrafico e filologico. Da un decennio, i suoi interessi si sono estesi anche alla letteratura biblica. Dopo alcuni articoli sparsi e il volume sulla *Storia e ideologia nell'Israele antico* (1986), in cui ha espresso la sua visione

d'insieme sulla tradizione biblica, ora ha presentato il suo primo « commentario ». Non a caso ha scelto il Cantico (= Ct), il « santo dei santi » della Scrittura che brucia le mani. Per chi, come noi, nei convegni dei veterotestamentaristi e semitisti organizzati dall'Associazione Biblica Italiana, ha avuto occasione di conoscere il prof. Garbini con i suoi interventi sempre intelligenti e sanamente provocatori, non è una sorpresa trovarsi davanti un lavoro con proposte originali e audaci. La recensione del suo lavoro diventa così un'occasione preziosa per continuare un fecondo dialogo, che lo spietato *chronos* relega sempre in fugaci ritagli di tempo.

Il libro, dopo una breve introduzione, è strutturato in tre parti: la ricostruzione del testo (21-167), l'interpretazione (169-289) e il significato del Ct (291-352). Completano il lavoro tre indici: dei termini ebraici, dei passi discussi e degli autori antichi e moderni (353-358).

Nella prima parte, l'A. confronta con acribia le più importanti testimonianze testuali: per l'ebraico, il TM viene confrontato con il frammento qumranico 6Q6, che ha conservato quasi integralmente 1,1-7 e ha due varianti proprie, e con le varianti significative dei manoscritti ebraici medievali catalogati da B. Kennicott e J. B. De Rossi; per il greco, viene offerto il testo del Vaticano nell'edizione di H. B. Swete (1907) confrontato con l'Allessandrino, il Sinaitico e con ciò che resta di Aquila, Simmaco, Teodoziona e del cosiddetto Ebraico (ed. F. Field, 1875); per il latino vengono riportate sia la *Vetus Latina* (D. de Bruyne, 1926) sia la *Vulgata* (Abbazia S. Gerolamo, Roma 1957); per il siriano, la traslitterazione della *Pešitta* secondo l'edizione critica curata da J. A. Emerton e D. J. Lane (Leiden 1979).

La finalità di questo accurato confronto è di ricostruire « un testo anteriore alla prima revisione rabbinica » (23). Il presupposto dal quale muove Garbini è infatti che l'« interpretazione » rabbinica, di cui parla ad esempio *Abot de Rabbi Natan*, sia stata in realtà una correzione del testo, per permetterne una lettura allegorica e così poter essere accolto nel canone (18). A sostegno di questa possibilità, da una parte ci sarebbe la datazione molto bassa del Ct (68 a. C., cf. la discussione in seguito) e dall'altra la convinzione che « il testo ebraico è diventato "intoccabile" soltanto dopo l'edizione normativa dei Ben Asher, nel X secolo d. C. » (18).

Tutto il lavoro critico precedente porta alla restituzione di un testo, quale poteva essere letto « in un ipotetico manoscritto del 50 a. C. » (24). Non si tratta propriamente di un'edizione critica in senso tradizionale, ma di un *nuovo testo* anche per ciò che riguarda l'ortografia, i cui criteri sono illustrati alle pp. 140-141. Sinceramente non riusciamo a vedere l'utilità di questa nuova scrittura e dobbiamo ringraziare i masoreti di non aver lavorato con criteri simili.

Quanto alla restituzione critica dell'ipotetico testo primitivo, il tutto si fonda su presupposti, che ci sembrano molto condizionati dall'orizzonte di comprensione che verremo esponendo. La fissazione definitiva del testo nel X secolo, senza togliere la possibilità di cambiamenti « ideologici », rivela in verità un vero e proprio lavoro critico *ante litteram*, alimentato dalla venerazione per il testo consonantico tradizionale: ne sono testimonianza i *puncta extraordinaria*, i *nun inversi*, i *sebirim*, i *qerê/ke'itib*, che, com'è noto, sono talvolta recensioni di varianti testuali precedenti, e la segnalazione esplicita

delle correzioni (*tiqqûnê sôpêrîm* e *‘ittûrê sôpêrîm*). La fissazione del testo consonantico deve essere invece fatta risalire alla fine del I secolo d.C. a Jamnia (cf. per tutto questo E. Würthwein, *Der Text des Alten Testaments* [Stuttgart 1988] 16-25). A questo riguardo, il testo consonantico scelto allora tra le diverse recensioni circolanti si dimostra complessivamente il migliore (Würthwein, *Der Text*, 19) e, nel caso specifico, non ci sembra abbia voluto cancellare dal Ct la valenza erotica. Rimane tutto da dimostrare l'assunto che esistesse un originale più provocante e con influssi ellenistici più accentuati, in particolare per quanto riguarda la personificazione di אֶרֶבָה e la sua identificazione con Eros.

La citazione di *Abot de Rabbi Natan* non è una prova sufficiente. Essa dice che Proverbi, Cantico e Qohelet erano libri נגזרים — «apocrifi», diremmo nel nostro linguaggio — «finché arrivarono gli uomini della grande sinagoga e li interpretarono» (עד שבאו אנשי כנסת הגדולה ופירשו אותם). Ora la Versione B degli *Abot de Rabbi Natan* sostituisce gli uomini della grande sinagoga della versione A (quella citata) con gli uomini di Ezechia. La sovrapposizione è stata possibile per due fattori: 1) il presupposto che il Ct fosse di Salomone; 2) la drastica riduzione del computo cronologico del periodo persiano presso gli antichi rabbini (cf. *Leçons des Pères du monde; Pirqê Avot et Avot de Rabbi Nathan*, tr. par E. Smilévitch [Lagrassse 1983] 85, n. 20). In ogni caso, la discussione verrebbe fatta risalire dagli *Abot* ad un periodo inverosimile; già G. Ricciotti (1928, 86) considerava leggenda la «grande sinagoga». Da altre fonti, del resto, possiamo dedurre che la canonicità del Ct, a differenza di Qohelet, non era affatto in discussione alla fine del I secolo d.C. (cf. m. Yad 3,5). E la testimonianza — sempre attribuita a R. ‘Aqiba e registrata in t. San 12,10 — che vieta di canticchiare il Ct in occasione di banchetti, riducendolo a canto d'amore profano, è una prova che in effetti venisse percepita — e mantenuta — la forte carica erotica.

Comunque sia, secondo Garbini il TM avrebbe introdotto 118 varianti rispetto all'ipotetico testo primitivo; tra queste, 56 sarebbero già attestate nelle diverse recensioni o traduzioni antiche. A ben guardare, molte delle correzioni non sono un miglioramento del TM e buona parte sono allineate con quella che A. Robert (1963) aveva chiamato *l'école voluptueuse*, il cui antesignano potrebbe essere considerato P. Haupt (1902).

Ad esempio, in Ct 1,3a l'«impossible» (28) מִיִּקֵּל viene corretto in מִיִּרָק part. Ho. da רִיקָל «che si effonde». La lezione è presupposta anche da Vulgata e Aquila, mentre 6Q6 ha מִיִּרָקָה מִיִּרָקָה una recensione da cui dipendono anche LXX e Vetus Latina. Per mantenere la *lectio difficilior*, più convincente rimane ancora la proposta di M.H. Pope (1977, 300): egli ha trovato in una lista ugaritica di generi vari (UT 145, 20), tra cui anche unguenti e vini, la possibile attestazione di una «marca» di profumo: *wṯn irpm wṯn trqm* «due (misure) di vino e due di profumo». In questo senso, la Syr ha intuito correttamente, ma, con una tecnica applicata anche in altri passi, ha tradotto con il generico *mwr*³.

In Ct 1,4b il masoretico מִיִּדְרִי non va cambiato al singolare, perché, anche al plurale, indica la camera o lo spazio più interno della *privacy*: si vedano Pro 7,27; 24,4; Qo 10,20; Is 26,20; in senso figurato Ez 8,12 e, con

una stupenda metafora applicata al sole, Gb 9,9. Con questo significato, il vocabolo è attestato in ugaritico, *hḏr* (stranamente con *h*), e soprattutto in arabo: *يَحْدَر* indica l'alcovia o il locale (i locali) in cui abitano le donne (il plurale *يَحْدَار* è nientemeno che il paradiso!). Ugualmente va lasciato *יְחַדְרָה*: R. Gordis (²1974, 78), seguendo Ibn Janah, ha dimostrato che la *יְחַדְרָה* copre anche il campo semantico dell'olfatto (cf. Lv 24,7; Is 66,3; Os 14,8; Sal 20,4).

Ancora meno convincente è il testo ricostruito per la «teofania» della dea-*אֶהְיָה* «metà orientale e metà greca», che parlerebbe alla donna innamorata (8,5-7). L'intuizione di far parlare direttamente la divinità dell'amore non è nuova (cf. M. H. Pope, 670, dopo aver citato *Antigone*, 781-801); e, prima ancora, F. Delitzsch proponeva di leggere tutti i suffissi al femminile al posto del maschile di TM. Garbini va ben oltre. In 8,5a, in sostituzione di *מִן־הַמְדָּבָר* a partire da LXX (λελευκανθισμένη) e VL (*candida*), che presupporrebbero qualcosa come *mlbnh*, propone un originario *מלבוּן*, «dal Libano» (il riferimento sarebbe alla patria della dea Astarte-Afrodite); *מִתְרַפֶּקֶת עַל־דֹּדָהָ*, vista la difficoltà di tutte le traduzioni, viene rimpiazzata da *מתעופפת ברדידה* «volteggiando nel suo velo», una lettura giudicata comunque «assai ipotetica» (118). La frase conclusiva (8,7b) del discorso della dea-Amore, «completamente sfigurata dal TM», sarebbe da ricostruire, unendo alcuni indizi di LXX, Vetus Latina e Targûm, come ripresa polemica del testo di Pro 6,25-35 — e in genere di donna *קְקָה* — e potrebbe essere:

Chi darà tutta la sua vita per Amore	אם יתן איש את כל נפשו באהבה
la salverà e non la perderà.	וישיענה ולא ירחיקנה

Ma questo testo ha, in fondo, come unica giustificazione l'allusione a Lc 9,24 e parr., vale a dire la comprensione «ideologica» che guida l'interpretazione e il significato del Ct.

Vi sono, tuttavia, alcune proposte apprezzabili, che non cambiano il testo consonantico e rivelano il ricco bagaglio filologico dell'A. Facciamo solo due esempi. In 1,5b *שְׁלֵמָה* viene vocalizzato, con molti commentatori moderni *שְׁלֵמָה*; non è la novità della proposta, ma la prova addotta ad attirare la nostra attenzione. Mentre tutti i commenti moderni si rubano l'un l'altro una citazione imprecisa di Hugo Winckler (la fonte precisa sarebbe: E. Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament; Dritte Auflage, mit Ausdehnung auf die Apokryphen, Pseudepigraphen und das Neue Testament*, neu bearbeitet von H. Zimmern-H. Winckler [Berlin 1903] 152), Garbini cita il più recente e probante G. Lankester Harding, *An Index and Concordance of Pre-Islamic Arabian Names and Inscriptions* (Toronto 1971) 325.

In 1,6a, tenendo presente Teocrito (X,26-27), una delle fonti ispiratrici del Ct largamente accettate a partire da Ugo Grozio, l'A. spiega l'oscuro verbo *שְׁפִתָּי* come un neologismo di fattura aramaizzante, formato dal prefisso causativo *-ש-* e dal sostantivo aramaico *יָי* «miele» (l'ebraico sarebbe *צִיָּה*; da qui il senso «render color miele» o simili. L'omografia con il verbo che ricorre in Gb 20,9 e 28,7 sarebbe solo casuale. La proposta, che si pone a livello semantico e non morfologico, sembra migliore di quella di M. Dahood (*Bib* 45 [1964] 406-407), che ipotizzava la presenza uno *šaphel*, de-

nominativo da $\nu\pi\iota$ «pece». Il risultato è, in questo caso, sicuramente più poetico.

Le scelte testuali generano l'interpretazione della seconda parte del libro (o sono generate da essa?). La volontà di trovare riferimenti erotici espliciti in molti passi, solo allusivi nel TM, annienta una poesia amorosa che è invece una sapiente scenografia di veli e svelamenti: non per falsa *pruderie*, ma perché è proprio dell'autentica poesia trasformare l'oggetto cantato, alludendo più che descrivendo (si veda a questo proposito il ritornello di 2,16 e 6,3). Prendiamo il passo delle «volpi» (2,15). È noto che il plurale greco $\alpha\lambda\omega\pi\eta\kappa\epsilon\varsigma$ è ambiguo, potendo significare «volpi» oppure «muscoli lombari». Tuttavia il quadretto va lasciato nella sua allusività, anche perché l'ispirazione teocritea è abbastanza evidente (stranamente questo idillio non viene citato per esteso nel commento, come gli altri passi di Teocrito, ma solo nell'elenco conclusivo di p. 289: come mai? avrebbe distrutto l'allegoria erotica che si stava cercando?):

Μισέω τὰς δασυκέρκους ἀλώπεκας, αἱ τὰ Μίκωνος
αἰεὶ φοιτῶσαι τὰ ποθ' ἔσπερα ῥαγίζοντι. (V, 112-113)

Poeticamente è molto più efficace il *simbolo* di una semplice *allegoria erotica*.

Questo è il nocciolo del problema interpretativo per il Ct. Siamo d'accordo con Garbini nell'affermare che il Ct non è un'allegoria e che molte esegesi della tradizione cristiana e giudaica hanno perso la concretezza dell'amore *cantato*, nella ricerca immediata di un *altro* significato. Tuttavia, il Ct non è neanche una monodia dell'amore erotico. Il Ct è *simbolo*: esaltando la potenza dell'amore umano si esprime — non al di sopra, ma *dentro* e *attraverso* di essa — la potenza di un Amore che ci supera e di cui ci sentiamo «sillaba incompiuta». La via simbolica nel commentare il Ct è percorsa, ad es., da L. Alonso Schökel, *El Cantar de los Cantares o La dignidad del amor* (Estella 1990), e da G. Ravasi, *Il Cantico dei Cantici* (Testi e Commenti 4; Bologna 1992).

Per comprendere la ricchezza del valore *simbolico* bisogna forse rifarsi alle pagine di Giovanni della Croce o alla lettura di Rainer Maria Rilke che ci è stata data da Romano Guardini. Quest'ultimo ha più volte sottolineato che l'occhio è «kein mechanischer Apparat, zu dessen Ergebnissen dann der Verstand die begriffliche Deutung gäbe, sondern sein Akt faßt geistig bestimmte Körperlichkeit, im stofflichen erscheinenden Geist auf» (*Die Offenbarung* [Würzburg 1940] 11-12). E, in analogia alla concezione interattiva della metafora, ma radicandosi nell'esperienza intrascendibile dell'umano, potremmo dire che il *simbolo* crea una nuova realtà, a partire dalla quale l'originale sembra ormai irreali. Il Ct è *simbolo* in questo senso forte: l'amore umano, rimanendo tale, diventa trasparenza del Dio Amore, armonizzazione di un *cantus firmus* che scopriamo iscritto e modulato nella nostra corporeità. Il Ct non è opera ideologica, ma poetica.

E siamo così alla terza parte del lavoro; in essa viene ricostruito il significato del libro. Sono senza dubbio pagine cattivanti: le più provocanti, ma anche le più problematiche, perché si costruisce un'ideologia generale su

fondamenta troppo esigue. Cerchiamo di sintetizzare anzitutto l'argomentazione di Garbini.

Il Ct potrebbe essere datato a partire dal 200 a.C. ma l'allusione alla storia di Susanna (Ct 8,13; cf. 287-288), se si accetta la datazione di A. Castastini (*EVO* 11 [1988] 195-204), farebbe scendere la data ai primi decenni del I secolo a.C. Più precisamente, il Ct rappresenterebbe «una presa di posizione estremamente polemica contro l'operato di Simeone [ben-Šetaḥ, che avrebbe fatto uccidere 80 donne in Ascalona] e l'ideologia che questi rappresentava» (295). Essendoci per Garbini anche un'allusione al matrimonio e alla fine infelice di Cleopatra Selene (Ct 6,12; cf. 249-251), la quale morì drammaticamente nel 69 a.C., la data di composizione viene fissata tra il 69 e il 67 (morte di Alessandra Salomè, sorella e sostenitrice di Simeone) e precisamente nel 68 a.C.

Contro l'operato di Simeone il Ct esalterebbe l'amore e quindi la donna, la quale, nella perfetta architettura di idilli ed epigrammi rintracciata nel libro, come in un caleidoscopio, assume le tre «figure» di sposa, donna libera e prostituta. Il poeta offrirebbe una rielaborazione originale ebraica del mito platonico di Amore e Psiche, in cui אַהבה si sostituisce e si contrappone alla נִשְׁתָּה di Pro 1-9, che a parere dell'A. fu redatto non molto tempo prima del Ct. Ciò comporterebbe anche una diversa lettura di Gen 3 (il testo che abbiamo sarebbe stato corretto!), perché «sotto il melo» (cf. Ct 8,5) la prima coppia, scoprendo la sessualità, «generò non la morte [...] ma l'amore, il quale, anzi, può vincere la morte» (341).

L'attesa espressa dal Sal 151 nel testo ebraico di Qumrān, il cui acrostico, con «debite» correzioni, viene letto *qwy 'hbbh šylw* «coloro che attendono il Messia Amore», e soprattutto l'attività di Gesù di Nazaret sarebbero l'interpretazione più tipica dell'ideologia propugnata dal Ct. Nonostante le reticenze degli evangelisti, il riferimento appare chiaramente in Gv, il quale da una parte «storicizza» il richiamo al Ct lungo tutta la narrazione del suo vangelo, e dall'altra ne offre un'interpretazione riduttiva (cf. soprattutto la I Gv). La cancellazione dell'interpretazione gesuanica si completerebbe nel II secolo, quando la grande chiesa ritornò definitivamente all'allegoresi della Sinagoga, per andare contro le posizioni di Simon Mago e degli gnostici, che assumevano il Ct in senso letterale come programma di vita.

Di fronte a tutte queste «suggerzioni» e «intuizioni», ci limitiamo a discutere la datazione, perché di esse è il punto di partenza e la pietra angolare (e l'unica argomentazione «oggettiva»). Una datazione così bassa, anche se teoricamente possibile, non è tuttavia giustificata. Gli unici argomenti addotti sono: da una parte, le possibili allusioni alla storia di Susanna (si dovrebbe accettare l'ipotesi di A. Castastini) e al matrimonio infelice di Cleopatra Selene; e dall'altra, l'ambientazione ideologica contro Simeone ben-Šetaḥ. Le allusioni sono prove molto labili e non convincenti. Rimane quindi da discutere il fatto delle 80 donne fatte uccidere da Simeone.

Ma il fatto, con molta probabilità, non è mai avvenuto. J. Neusner (*The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70; Part I: The Masters* [Leiden 1971] 130-133) ricostruisce la *Überlieferungsgeschichte* di questo aneddoto da SifDeut 221 e m. San 6,4, attraverso y. San 6,3, sino a y. Ḥag

2,2c e y. San 6,6c (Garbini purtroppo cita solo le pp. 90-91 dello studio di Neusner per dimostrare la recenziorità della notizia che queste donne fossero «streghe»). Secondo E. Schürer, *Storia del popolo giudaico al tempo di Gesù*, vol. I [Brescia 1985] 297, «la notizia della Mishna [...] non offre alcun solido fondamento per una conclusione storica». Dello stesso parere era già J. Derenbourg, *L'histoire et la géographie de la Palestine, d'après les Thalmud et les autres sources rabbiniques* [Paris 1867] 106-107. J. Klausner, *הסטוריה ישראלית שצורים בדברי-ימי-ישראל Jhdwt w'nwšjw* (Jerusalem-Tel Aviv 1924-1925) II, 134, ipotizza che vi sia all'origine della tradizione una confusione tra Simeone ben-Šetaḥ e Simeone Maccabeo. Non abbiamo trovato nessuno tra gli storici che, in qualche modo, accetti la storicità dell'episodio. In ogni caso, i testi parlano dell'uccisione di «80 donne in Ascalona» e rimane ancora da dimostrare che quest'espressione mishnica sia un eufemismo per «prostitute» e che il loro eventuale massacro sia avvenuto a Gerusalemme.

In conclusione: è vero, e ne diamo atto a Garbini, che il Ct ha avuto un forte influsso su Gesù di Nazaret e in particolare su Gv. Non si può più sostenere con J. Winandy (*RB* 71 [1964] 161-190) che nel Nuovo Testamento non vi siano tracce di quest'influsso. Tuttavia, le due posizioni, pur essendo opposte nelle conclusioni, si assomigliano nel metodo. Ci sembra che Garbini abbia imbrigliato l'alta poesia del Ct nel rigido schema di una polemica ideologica. Il Ct è poesia lirica, e lirica amorosa. La lirica è libera, l'amore creativo. Può una polemica ideologica esaurire il *simbolo* forgiato dalla creatività di una lirica che canta la libertà dell'amore?

Seminario Arcivescovile di Milano
I-21040 Venegono Inf. (VA)

Gianantonio BORGONOVO

David USSISHKIN, *The Village of Silwan. The Necropolis from the Period of the Judean Kingdom*. Jerusalem, Israel Exploration Society [&] Yad Izhak ben-Zvi, 1993. ix-364 p. 211 fig. 21 × 27,5. \$40.00 (\$36.00)

This beautifully produced volume brings within the domain of biblical archeology a portion of the Jerusalem landscape which has much attracted the attention of scholarly visitors. "The factual data" begins on p. 17 with a brief overall survey and then from p. 36 to 237 a businesslike description of each of the 50 explored tombs in the numerical order assigned to them. Also included on p. 241-254 are the four inscriptions, though a good part of this inquiry perforce goes beyond the purely factual to a discussion of controversies over the readings. The chief of these is what Clermont-Ganneau had rightly seen as [*ašer 'al ha-]bayit*, "The tomb of the royal steward", No. 35. also of special interest is No. 3, which has long been called the "Tomb of Pharaoh's Daughter" since a proposal of de Saulcy in 1851 based on an inference from 1 Kgs 3,1; it has meanwhile become the property of the Russian Church. The flat roof of this tomb is seen with

Avigad to have been originally crowned with a pyramid, like the one still seen today on the "Tomb of Zechariah" (not a part of the present research, like the "Tomb of Absalom" farther north). The tombs numbered 20 to 27 became the property of the Franciscans in consequence of Conrad Schick's conjecture that No. 22 (mentioning Isaiah) or others of this group had been transformed into Christian churches.

Most of the other tombs are without particular interest in themselves but chiefly as permitting a classification by categories or chronological "strata". Many had been later used as quarries or for occupation by (Christian) hermits. But the second major section of the book, "Analysis of the data" (reserved for "conclusions" which though "hypothetical, are highly convincing" as p. 18 puts it) is able to connect virtually all these tombs as a single chronological unit with the period of Judean monarchy, and even with the last part of the eighth century (p. 327, listing seven criteria for this contention). This chronology is in part based on an extensive sampling of similar tombs from Anatolia and Cyprus (apparently not including the Ugarit tombs which bear a casual resemblance to Tamassos fig. 206; but there is no Index to make possible further verification).

The insistence of the author that these chronological and historical conclusions must be kept rigidly separate from the purely "factual" data is highly commendable. Nevertheless he might well have begun the whole book with a brief preview outline of what in fact the steps of his procedure would be, in place of the repetitious comments on squallor and uncooperativeness of the modern inhabitants, which could have been tucked into a later footnote, since bigger things are at stake, and these did not after all prevent accumulating and expressing this highly valuable scholarly material.

Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Roma

Robert NORTH SJ

Novum Testamentum

Joel MARCUS, *The Way of the Lord*. Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark. Louisville, Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992. xv-240 p. 16 × 23,5. \$25.00

Dopo lo studio su Mc 4,1-34 (cf. *Bib.* 68 [1987] 277-279), l'A. offre un altro pregevole contributo all'interpretazione di Marco, affrontando un tema di grande importanza ma abbastanza trascurato. In effetti, anche se il problema negli anni più recenti è stato oggetto di accresciuta attenzione, stimolata dal rinnovato interesse per il fenomeno letterario della intertestualità, e soprattutto per il rapporto fra giudaismo e cristianesimo, l'ultima monografia era rimasta quella di A. Suhl (1965), che sulla linea di W. Marxsen smi-

nuiva eccessivamente la dimensione storico-salvifica di Mc, e generalmente non era stata ritenuta convincente.

Data l'ampiezza del materiale, l'A. seleziona per questo studio le citazioni bibliche che assumono maggiore rilevanza sotto il profilo cristologico, e precisamente: all'inizio del racconto (Mc 1,2-3); nel battesimo (1,9-11); nella trasfigurazione (9,2-8); nel dialogo su Elia (9,11-13); nella parabola dei vignaioli (12,10-11); nel dibattito sul Figlio di Davide (12,35-37); e infine nel racconto della passione (14-16). Per quest'ultimo, nel quale il riferimento alle Scritture è più continuo, lo studio è suddiviso in base ai riferimenti principali: Zc 9-14, Dn 7, i salmi del giusto sofferente, i canti del Servo del Signore.

All'interno di ogni studio, M. stabilisce innanzitutto quale forma del testo biblico sia utilizzata o presupposta (TM, LXX, targumim, traduzione *ad hoc*, conflazioni...); ricostruisce poi la traiettoria dell'interpretazione del testo nel giudaismo alla luce della lettura canonica ed extracanonica (pseudopigrafi, Qumrân, giudaismo ellenistico, scritti rabbinici); infine precisa l'interpretazione marciiana non solo sotto il profilo cristologico ma anche in riferimento alla vita della comunità. Dal punto di vista metodologico si sforza di integrare l'approccio sincronico con quello diacronico: quest'ultimo, sebbene a volte ipotetico, è importante per confermare che il redattore non ha semplicemente ripreso le allusioni veterotestamentarie dalla tradizione ma le ha comprese e condivise, e a volte ulteriormente sviluppate.

Nella conclusione l'A. mette a confronto il modo di utilizzare le Scritture in Mc con quello del giudaismo. Numerosi gli elementi di continuità: la rilettura in senso escatologico-messianico; il rinvio ai contesti originari anche al di là degli elementi citati (qui però sarebbe stato il caso di confrontarsi maggiormente con coloro che sostengono un'utilizzazione a volte «atomistica» dei testi veterotestamentari); la scelta della versione più confacente o il ritocco del testo stesso in funzione dell'applicazione; tecniche esegetiche per riconciliare asserzioni bibliche apparentemente contraddittorie (assai interessante in tal senso l'analisi del dialogo su Elia e di quello sul Figlio di Davide); la conflazione di testi affini; l'estensione dell'autorità scritturistica dal testo anche all'interpretazione tradizionale. L'elemento di discontinuità è dato in sostanza dal riferimento a Gesù, all'evento della passione e risurrezione, che colloca i testi in una nuova luce e fa emergere un senso irraggiungibile a partire unicamente dai testi stessi. Ma questa «asimmetria» del rapporto tra i due Testamenti, questo maggior peso dell'elemento nuovo rispetto a quello antico, non significa che l'interpretazione proceda unicamente a partire dal nuovo e che il linguaggio delle Scritture di Israele sia solo una delle tante modalità espressive delle Scritture, come voleva Suhl con Marxsen, prese dall'ambiente e utilizzate per formulare il *kyrigma* (cf. 108 con la nota 52). Si tratta invece di un «orizzonte» entro il quale dev'essere collocato l'evento pasquale come adempimento delle attese salvifiche di Israele (cf. 41: «the indispensable framework within which Mark's Christology operates»).

A queste conclusioni generali l'A. (ricollegandosi anche ad altri suoi studi precedenti) aggiunge anche un'ipotesi storica più precisa sulla situazione di origine di Mc: l'opera sarebbe nata in una stretta connessione, sia

geografica che cronologica, con gli eventi della prima guerra giudaica, in contrapposizione al nazionalismo zelotico, che spesso si appellava a quei medesimi testi, e con l'intento di confermare la comunità nella fede nel Messia crocefisso e nella sua sequela nella sofferenza. Abbastanza problematica resta però, a nostro avviso, l'ulteriore congettura secondo cui Marco nel descrivere il cammino di Gesù verso Gerusalemme reinterpreterebbe il tema veterotestamentario della « guerra santa »; qualche argomentazione in tal senso ci sembra un po' forzata (così per es. a p. 36, a proposito di Mc 10,32-34, quando partendo dall'osservazione che ἀναβαίνει era divenuto termine tecnico per il pellegrinaggio a Gerusalemme, e che nel Deutero-Isaia questo tema era stato fuso con quello della guerra santa, si trasferisce immediatamente questa tematica al testo marciano). Ma si tratta di qualche punto di minore importanza che non sminuisce la solidità e la esemplare chiarezza del lavoro, in ordine ai temi di fondo, l'uso delle Scritture e la cristologia marciana.

Poiché l'A. ha il merito di utilizzare anche bibliografia italiana, avrebbe potuto menzionare anche qualche altro studio direttamente attinente al suo tema, come B. Biguzzi, *Io distruggerò questo tempio. Il tempio e il giudaismo nel vangelo di Marco* (Roma 1987); E. Manicardi, *Il cammino di Gesù nel Vangelo di Marco. Schema narrativo e tema cristologico* (AnBib 96; Roma 1981); id., *Gesù e la sua morte secondo Marco 15,33-37* in AA. VV., *Gesù e la sua morte* (Atti della XXVII settimana biblica; Brescia 1984) 9-28; ed il nostro: « Rivelazione di Gesù – rivelazione di Dio. Il problema del "Dio di Gesù Cristo" nella prospettiva marciana », *La scuola cattolica* 117 (1989) 149-166.

Corso Mazzini, 129
I-86100 Campobasso

Vittorio FUSCO

Robert H. STEIN, *Luke* (The New American Commentary). Nashville, Broadman Press, 1992. 642 p. 16 × 23,5

John B. POLHILL, *Acts* (The New American Commentary). Nashville, Broadman Press, 1992. 574 p. 16 × 23,5

These two volumes belong to the new forty-volume series, The New American Commentary (NAC), designed primarily to enable pastors, teachers, and students to read the Bible with clarity and proclaim it effectively. The NAC continues the heritage of a commentary project at the end of the nineteenth century, An American Commentary, and is unapologetically confessional and rooted in the evangelical tradition. The NAC focuses on two concerns. It emphasizes how each section of a book fits together and concentrates on theological exegesis so that the reader sees the theological unity of each book. Secondly, since the Bible essentially belongs to the church and so should build up the whole body of Christ, this series provides practical, applicable exposition.

The authors in this series do wrestle with the issues raised by the scholarly community surrounding each book and themselves determine the nature and length of the introductory material. However, discussions relating to contemporary scholarship and technical points of grammar and syntax generally appear in the footnotes. Although the editors selected the *New International Version (NIV)* as the standard translation for the commentary because of its faithfulness to the original languages and its beautiful and readable style, sometimes the given authors, who also represent countries outside the United States, differ from the *NIV* in their own translations from the Greek and Hebrew texts.

Both Stein and Polhill adhere to the goals of the series, and there is much that is valuable in their commentaries on Luke's two volumes. Stein is particularly attentive to the biblical text and parallels while Polhill is better acquainted with secondary literature. Given the nature of the series, neither author directly addresses a scholarly audience.

Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Roma

Robert F. O'TOOLE, SJ

J. Daryl CHARLES, *Literary Strategy in the Epistle of Jude*. Scranton, University of Scranton Press – London and Toronto, Associated University Presses, 1993. 258 p. 16 × 24. \$39.50

Jude has been called "the most neglected book in the New Testament". It is therefore somewhat surprising that after quoting this comment Dr Charles can go on almost immediately to append a footnote listing some 24 recent items, with in addition several text-critical studies. That does not exactly suggest neglect! These are however articles, scattered in a wide range of journals and *Festschriften* and not always readily accessible. The letter is of course included in commentary series, usually in association with one or more of the other short epistles, but "most existing commentaries on Jude are highly derivative" (172, n. 3). Charles effectively cites R.J. Bauckham's remark: "The usual scholarly judgments about Jude are little more than clichés which have simply been repeated for a century or more without reexamination" (*ANRW* II.25.5 [1988] 3792). The real evidence of neglect lies in the dearth of monographs, and this book will go a long way towards remedying that deficiency.

A brief Introduction is followed by four main chapters, one devoted to a Literary Rhetorical Analysis of Jude, a second to the Epistle in its Palestinian Milieu, the third to the use of the Old Testament in Jude, and the fourth to the use of extra-biblical source material. The whole is rounded off by a brief concluding chapter, followed by some 58 pages of notes and 25 of bibliography. Since Jude itself consists of only 25 verses, it may seem excessive to devote to it a volume of over 250 pages, but that would be a superficial judgment. The approach involves consideration of a wide range of topics, and discussion of comparable material, and this of necessity

requires appropriate space. Some of the notes contain detailed documentation of the secondary literature on specific points, which will be invaluable to those seeking orientation in the subjects addressed.

Inevitably, there are flaws, some no doubt the fault of the publishers but others the responsibility of the author. It is common usage today to transliterate words in Hebrew, Syriac or Aramaic, but these are normally single words adduced for clarity, so that the reader who so desires may know what term appears in the original. Here transliteration is used for Greek also, not only for single words but at one point for the complete text of Jude. For those who have no Greek, this is pointless: the text is no more comprehensible in transliteration than in Greek lettering; those who know the language are perfectly capable of reading Greek script, and would probably prefer it. As it is, one is sometimes uncertain whether to read straight across both columns, or take two lines in one column together before crossing to the other. Many will simply have recourse to the Greek New Testament (since only verses 1, 3, 5, 17 and 24 are numbered, that does not make for ease of reference).

The proof-reading is not all that could be wished for, although many of the errors are not such as to create problems for the reader (e.g. "Palestian" on p.70, or "bearly" on p.159 ["barely"]; "flair" appears twice as "flare" at p.37-38); in particular, there are several mistakes in the spelling of foreign names. At some points one suspects an error in the transcription of a written text to typescript: e.g. Herod the Greek (68) is presumably Herod the Great, Didymus of Alexandria (144) of Alexandria, and "animatism" (22) should possibly be "animation" (Demetrius in the passage cited speaks of the use of metaphor to make inanimate things appear ἐμψυχοί). Such faults are unfortunate, since they arouse suspicion as to the author's care and thoroughness, the more regrettable in that the book in general is carefully researched, thoroughly documented, and well arranged.

Dr Charles tends to the conservative side, as is evidenced *inter alia* in his appendix on Pseudonymity (83-90), where he quotes Paul's speech at Miletus in Acts 20,28-31 as if it were solid historical fact (88). "To consider Jude, 2 Peter, or any books of the NT as pseudonymous is to acknowledge that they possess *less than fully divine authority*" (89; italics original). In general, he is critical of biblical scholars, and in particular of NT scholarship, but does not seem to realise that in making a study of Jude he is himself involved in NT scholarship. Conservative studies are welcome, but they should not begin with the apparent assumption that "critical" scholars are not only wrong but wrong headed, if not actually intent upon the undermining of the faith once delivered to the saints. The real question is whether an author is honestly and sincerely trying to grapple with the problems, to face the issues that are involved. In this connection it is worth recalling some words written by Howard Marshall in the foreword to a volume of essays: "We have written as conservative evangelicals who combine a high regard for the authority of Holy Scripture with the belief that we are called to study it with the full use of our minds" (*New Testament Interpretation* [ed. I. Howard Marshall] [Exeter 1977]). That is surely the correct approach.

The words quoted above from p. 89 indicate one of the issues raised by this book: that of authority and inspiration. Affirmation of pseudonymity would appear to entail denial of canonicity: if the Church had known the book to be pseudonymous, it would not have received it as canonical. Since Jude is included in the canon, it cannot be pseudonymous. It is however possible that by the time decisions were being made about the NT canon the Church no longer knew that Jude was pseudonymous, that this letter was in the end included because it had proved its worth. It was of course one of the seven letters that were the last to gain acceptance, and Jerome says that some rejected it because it appealed to the Book of Enoch, a non-canonical work. But does a book have to be canonical, or inspired, to be quoted? Did the Apostolic Fathers regard the NT books they cite as canonical? Does 1 Clement quote Hebrews because the author regarded it as inspired? At that stage the idea of a canon of the NT had not yet emerged. As for pseudonymity, which Charles himself describes as "evidently not a rare phenomenon" (199, n. 154), one need only look at the NT Apocrypha, or the passage he quotes from Jerome at p. 220, n. 94; it was in fact a very common phenomenon. In regard to inspiration, Dr Charles sometimes seems to work with ideas similar to that current in the ancient world, that the divine spirit or deity operated within the inspired person to the exclusion of his or her natural faculties; but that is scarcely an adequate conception of inspiration for today. Here however there are questions which cannot be discussed in a brief review. Rightly or wrongly, most modern scholars would think, as does Charles himself on occasion, of an author using his own resources and developing a strategy for the achievement of his purpose.

Dr Charles is certainly correct in rejecting a dating of Jude in the second century because of the "gnostic" character of the opponents in view, but does not seem to be fully abreast of recent developments in *Gnosisforschung*. A long ago as 1909 Robert Law wrote that 1 Corinthians shows "into how congenial a soil the seeds of Gnosticism were about to fall" (*The Tests of Life* [Edinburgh 1909] 28; cf. Charles, 49: "evidence of fertile soil in which later heretical features may have germinated"), and recent studies have tended to underline the presence of "gnosticising" trends and tendencies already in the first century. These tendencies are however not yet the full-scale Gnosticism of the second-century systems, and to use these systems to give shape and contours to this early "gnosis" is to run the risk of reading first-century documents with second-century spectacles (cf. Charles p. 52 — but he is not the first to voice this warning). Most modern scholars would probably date the letter somewhere about 80 or 90 AD, which could leave the question of authenticity or pseudonymity open. Decisions on the latter question are more likely to be governed by assessments of the style and language of the letter, the quality of the Greek: is this likely to have been written by a Galilean of little or no formal education?

Reference to literary and rhetorical analysis conjures up the vision of some modern scholars who amass batteries of references to Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian and other rhetorical authors, as if the NT authors wrote

in book-lined studies with these authorities at hand for reference (it should be said at once that Dr Charles is not guilty of this). In fact, anyone engaging in communication of any kind must learn by experience the "tricks of the trade", the ways and means of getting his message across to his audience. The rhetoricians distilled the essence of such experience into their writings, but the fact that a Palestinian Jew could on occasion be found to follow the same procedures need not mean that he had read their works. Dr Charles in discussing the Palestinian milieu makes much of the influence of Hellenism in first-century Palestine — but in an earlier article (*NTS* 37 [1991] 139) he wrote that the Jewish literature emerging from a Palestinian milieu in the second century BC "was fervently anti-Hellenistic". This only serves to show that this is an area in which it is dangerous to make general statements, and once again raises questions which cannot be fully discussed in a review. Just what effect did the Maccabean revolt have in regard to Hellenistic influence? In this connection, one notable omission from the bibliography is the revised English edition of Schürer (*History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* [ed. G. Vermes—F. Millar—M. Black] [Edinburgh 1973; 1979], the second volume of which (1979) has an extended discussion of Hellenism in the Jewish regions (52-80; cf. also the index in vol. III.2 [1987]).

One final small point may be mentioned: on p. 100 it is said that the verb προγράφειν, which occurs four times in the NT, "carries a specific penal sense, viz. that of a public accusation against criminals", and a footnote refers to Schrenk's article in *TDNT* I, 700-772. Schrenk however would seem to distinguish three uses, a temporal in Rom 15,4 and Eph 3,3, a "penal" in Jude 4 (cf. Lightfoot), and in regard to Gal 3,1 to be rather closer to the definition given more than a century ago by Lightfoot: "the common word to describe all public notices or proclamations" (*Galatians* [London—Cambridge 1890] 134).

This review has been largely critical on points of detail, but this should not be allowed to detract from the very real merits of Dr Charles's work. The concern of this book is with identifying the literary strategy of Jude, the ways and means utilised by its author to bring his message home to his audience. In the course of his study Dr Charles covers a wide range, effectively marshalling his material. With some qualifications his work may be commended as a substantial contribution. It is a book to be read and studied, and argued with.

10 Murray Field Road
St Andrews
Scotland KY 16 9 NB

R. McL. WILSON

Raymond F. COLLINS, *Divorce in the New Testament* (Good News Studies 38). Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 1992. xv-389 p. 13 × 21. \$19.95

That the New Testament, and perhaps even Jesus of Nazareth himself, had something to say about the subject of divorce is beyond question. What Jesus in fact said about divorce and what the NT did with the tradition of his saying it have been, and will continue to be, discussed so long as they "marry and are given in marriage". The literature of the on-going discussion of divorce in the NT is so vast that, every once in a while, one needs to stop and go over it, to assess the various contributions and to draw up a balance sheet of the results. This is the task Father Collins has set out for himself: "to offer an independent and self-contained exegesis" of the tradition of Jesus' sayings within their own context and their own "historical and literary tradition". To this end he wields the formidable tools of the historical-critical method impressively, marshals the results of his vast erudition adroitly, and weighs the resulting evidence judiciously and fairly.

True to his stated purpose, C. first takes up Paul's 1 Corinthians 7 in two successive chapters, one that deals with 7,10-11 ("not I, but the Lord"), and the other with 7,12-16 ("I say, not the Lord"). He distinguishes two problems, both in Paul and elsewhere in the NT, that of separation and divorce (*chôrizô* and *aphiêmi*), and that of remarriage. To at least one reader, however, it is difficult to see how the first, separation and divorce, can be a real problem without the second, remarriage. What the prohibition of separation and/or divorce itself achieves is difficult to say. Is such a prohibition any more effective or enforceable than, say, the love command in the New Testament? Within the context of the NT and within the Christian scheme of things, the separation or the divorce of the partners becomes a problem only when the question of remarriage arises. The church seems not to have had too much difficulty with the parting of two married partners to lead their separate lives in some monastery or convent hard by.

Moreover, whether philosophy is the way out of the difficulty of what it was the Lord said about the matter, and whether either Greek vocable (*chôrizô*, *aphiêmi*) can be made to bear the burden of so much reasoning, are alike questions that readers will have to determine for themselves in assessing the author's argument. Nevertheless, having examined the Jesus tradition from every angle and under every aspect, C. concludes that the "apostle's paraenesis, or moral exhortation" is very clearly that "Neither wife nor husband may divorce their spouse" (39). Of course, at the basis of this prohibition is "the two shall become one flesh" (Gen 2,24) which occurs as a refrain in Matt 19,6; Mark 10,8; 1 Cor 6,16 and Eph 5,31, and finds echoes in Rom 7,1-3. Whatever else may or may not be argued from the rest of the tradition, it is quite clear that the stability of the union and the indissolubility of marriage are inscribed deeply in it.

Yet, despite the firmness of the "two in one flesh" argument, God's people — before Christ and after him — had to face the inevitable

adjustment of the proposed ideal to the lived reality. Thus, the second chapter on 1 Corinthians 7, titled "A Related Matter", takes up the famous question of "mixed marriages". The non-believing spouses in the Roman world being free to divorce, there is little either Jesus or Paul can say about the matter in the first century. The author is certain that the word of the Lord was "normative" only in marriages where both partners were Christian (45). To this reviewer, at least, this squares neither with Paul's understanding of the Lordship of Christ nor with what the word of the Lord is all about. Is it conceivable that such a word binds a believer married to another believer but not one married to a non-believer? Indeed, in 1 Corinthians, as in the rest of the NT, forbidding divorce is — and in fact can only be — an exhortation, not a law. C. is, of course, perfectly aware of this. The only real question is, Can a divorced believer remarry? Before Jesus and after him, married people separated, divorced and went their separate ways, both inside the believing community and outside it. What those within the community wanted to know was and is, Can they remarry and still be part of this community? Having concluded, as indeed he has to, that Paul "does recognize that these *agamoi* can remarry", C. feels the need to add, "Much to our frustration, however, Paul has not talked about his expectation" (64). But Paul has.

These two chapters on 1 Cor 7, alas, miss both the reason and the significance of Paul's formulation of a decision which is, in J. Murphy-O'Connor's words, "in flat contradiction to Jesus' prohibition of divorce" (1 *Corinthians*, 66), not just in permitting a true divorce but also in recognizing the right, at least in one specified instance, to remarry. Nothing, moreover, in the case described by Paul in 1 Cor 7,12-15, would mark it as unique. Paul is giving a theological opinion, not legislating.

The reason Paul takes his position on divorce and remarriage is stated clearly at the very start of his discussion in 1 Cor 7: "But each has a particular gift (*charisma*) from God, one having one kind and another a different kind" (7,7b in the *NRSV*, which C. uses throughout his book). Whether single or divorced, if you have not the *charisma* of sexual abstinence, then you should marry (7,2.5.9.28.36). To some, this might not sound like a very lofty reason for marriage, but Paul finds it a compelling one and argues accordingly. In the abundance of good sense he displays throughout his epistle, Paul recognizes that the believers, who in the first place married precisely because they lacked the *charisma* to remain celibate — or, to put it positively, because they possessed a "different kind" of *charisma*, viz., to marry — were not bound to spend the rest of their days "afire with passion", no matter what Jesus or the tradition about Jesus said. Paul knew, as many of his followers have chosen not to know, that you cannot demand or legislate a charism. Indeed, neither the words of Jesus nor the vehicles of their transmission are meant to be a pandect of laws and prescriptions. The Paul who knew only too well that "For freedom Christ has set us free" (Gal 5,1) knew that Christians were called to this "peace", this freedom, as Conzelmann rightly reads 1 Cor 7,15b (Conzelmann, 1 *Corinthians*, 123). The believers were not meant to be subjected to a new slavery by Jesus' or anybody else's word. For Paul at

least, ascetism is not a means of salvation. The New Testament, whatever else it might be, is simply not a book of laws or prescriptions. Therein lies the significance of Paul's dealing with "the word of the Lord". Consequently, New Testament exegesis, however else it might be employed, is not legal interpretation.

The chapter on Mark, "The Debate", sets the pattern for the next three on Matthew: textual criticism followed by literary and form criticism; context and historical background and situation; then redaction criticism and the implications of all these for the dominical logion. The author even takes up Mark 10,1-12 and comments verse by verse on it before concluding, "Mark gives his reader an expanded version (v.12) of a traditional dominical logion (v.11) for which he has provided not only a didactic setting (v.10) but also an enlightening object lesson (vv.2-9), for which he has also created an appropriate narrative setting" (103). But surely the liberty Mark took with the dominical saying, even in adapting it to a new and relatively different Gentile situation, has to be indicative of something more than his redactional talent. Is not the evangelist's whole procedure evidence of an attitude to a dominical saying which is far removed from that of those who are so eager to determine what it is precisely that Jesus or the New Testament teaches about "divorce and remarriage". In the course of his argument, C. has some very illuminating observations to make about the use of Scripture. Why then could not Mark's argument on divorce benefit to the full from them?

The subsequent chapters on Matthew can prove frustrating to the reader. Just as you are ready to see a conclusion reached from an imposingly erudite discussion, off to another you are forced to turn your attention. In setting out his aim and purpose in the introduction to his book, C. gives every indication of being a born teacher. So the only explanation that can justify such tantalizing procedure is a reluctance to make explicit the conclusion that stares one in the face. The reader is kept waiting for that famous exceptive clause in Matthew; but, three chapters, 109 pages, 548 endnotes, and come dozen already proposed solutions later, we are told, "Matthew did not see the exception as a derogation from the challenge of Jesus' word; rather, he saw that word as he had come to know it as a challenge to those who attempted to use God's word against itself" (213).

To be sure, blurb writers are not under oath. But such a conclusion can hardly "aid anyone in pain over the vital issues of divorce and remarriage". From Paul, as from the Synoptics, the handling of the dominical logion on divorce in particular ought to be a reminder for all who read the New Testament that it is simply not a book that erects either the words of Jesus or its own words as a "helpful resource for students of moral theology and canon law", as the blurb confidently promises.

The author, of course, is not unaware of this. He himself considers that "Jesus' saying on divorce was a prophetic utterance, rather than a community regulation... It condemned divorce and its consequences, rather than a second marriage as such" (222). There is a conclusion clamouring to be drawn from this. If the "prophetic utterance" of Jesus proclaimed

“divorce to be a violation of the Decalogue’s prohibition of adultery”, then by what exegetical method was this variation on a sin in the Decalogue deemed unforgivable? The reluctance to draw a conclusion from Paul, as from Mark and Matthew, about how not to treat the word of the Lord is perhaps the most disappointing aspect of this book.

Nevertheless, the book under review remains a most valuable resource for the exegetes of the New Testament. Its imposing bibliography and the wealth of its endnotes are sure to make it a work to be queried as well as quarried by anyone who wants to study, not just the question of divorce in the New Testament, but also the varied modes of approach to its problems employed by scholars in this century. Unfortunately, at the outset, the author set for himself an impossible task by intending his book for “scholar and believer alike”. Those in the former category are bound to find the extensive “introduction to the NT” material, not only unnecessary, but distracting; those in the latter are sure to get lost in discussions that require a scientific background they cannot reasonably be expected to possess, and languages (including Russian, in note 91 on Mark) they simply do not command. When you add to this the singular disservice of extensive endnotes relegated to the last third of the book and with only chapter numbers for headings by a publisher who produced — or reproduced? — a text remarkably free of typographical errors, the difficulty of reading the book through looms almost insurmountable.

3 Phillips Place
Cambridge, MA 02138 USA

Stanley B. MARROW

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

An dieser Stelle werden die für *Biblica* eingesandten Bücher verzeichnet. Eine Beurteilung ist damit nicht gegeben. Werke, die von der Redaktion nicht ausdrücklich erbeten worden sind, werden nicht zurückgesandt, auch wenn ihnen eine weitere Besprechung nicht zuteil werden kann.

Eingesandte Bücher und Artikel gehen an den Redaktor des *Elenchus of Biblical Bibliography* zur Anzeige nach dessen Gutbefinden.

Die Anschrift, an die wir die Sendungen zu richten bitten, ist: Schriftleitung *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Via della Pilotta 25, I-00187 Roma, Italien.

Agourides, S. – Hahn, F. – Lambrecht, J., et al., *The Truth of the Gospel*. Galatians 1:1 – 4:11 (Monograph Series of "Benedictina" 12). Rome, "Benedictina" Publishing, 1993. 288 p. 17 × 24

Alden, Robert L., *Job* (The New American Commentary 11). Nashville, Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1993. 432 p. 16 × 23,5. \$27.99

Allison, Dale C., *The New Moses*. A Matthean Typology. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1993. xvi-396 p. 14,5 × 22,5

Beilner, Wolfgang – Ernst, Michael, *Unter dem Wort Gottes*. Theologie aus dem Neuen Testament. Thaur – Wien – München, Kulturverlag, 1993. 903 p. 17 × 23

Bernstein, Alan E., *The Formation of Hell*. Death and Retribution in the Ancient and Early Christian Worlds. London, UCL Press Limited, 1993. XIII-392 p. 16 × 24. £25.00

Brenner, Athalya (ed.), *A Feminist Companion to Judges* (The Feminist Companion to the Bible 4). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1993. 242 p. 14 × 21,5. £16.50 – \$24.50

Caba, José, S.J., *Cristo, Pan de Vida*. Teologia eucaristica del IV Evangelio (BAC 531). Madrid, Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1993. 671 p. 13 × 20

Carbone, Sandro Paolo – Rizzi, Giovanni, *Amos*. Lettura ebraica, greca e aramaica. Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1993. 176 p. 17 × 24. Lit. 27.000

Corley, Kathleen A., *Private Women, Public Meals*. Social Conflict in the Synoptic Tradition. Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 1993. xxi-217 p. 15,5 × 23,5. \$19.95

Evans, Craig A., *Word and Glory*. On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John's Prologue (JSNT Supplement Series 89). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1993. 243 p. 14 × 22. £35.00 – \$50.00

Giorgio, Vincenzo – Paganelli, Rinaldo, *Il catechista incontra la Bibbia* (Educatori e catechisti). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1994. 283 p. 14 × 21,5. Lit. 21.000

Grelot, Pierre, *Combats pour la Bible en Église*. Une brassée de souvenirs (L'histoire à vif). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1994. 415 p. 13,5 × 21,5. FF 175

Grelot, Pierre, *Dieu, le Père de Jésus-Christ* (Jésus et Jésus-Christ 60). Paris, Desclée, 1994. 368 p. 15 × 22,5

Heen, Erik, *Anton Fridrichsen (1888-1953)*. A Bibliography (Bibliography Series 5). Oslo, University of Oslo Faculty of Theology, 1993. 153 p. 15 × 21

Kaufman, Stephen A. – Sokoloff, Michael, *A Key-word-in-context Concordance to Targum Neofiti*. A Guide to the Complete Palestinian Aramaic Text of the Torah (Publications of the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project 2). Baltimore – London, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993. x-1494 p. 22 × 28,5. \$150.00

Klauck, Hans-Josef, *Alte Welt und neuer Glaube*. Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte, Forschungsgeschichte und Theologie des Neuen Testaments (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 29). Freiburg, Universitätsverlag – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994. 315 p. 16 × 23,5

Kreitzer, Larry J., *The New Testament in Fiction and Film*. On Reversing the Hermeneutical Flow (The Biblical Seminar 17). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1993. 168 p. 14 × 22. £10.50 – \$14.50

Lang, Bernhard, *Drewermann interprète de la Bible*. Le paradis. La naissance du Christ (Théologies). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1994. 172 p. 14,5 × 23,5. FF 118

Lee, Bernard J., *Jesus and the Metaphors of God*. The Christs of the New Testament (Conversation on the road not taken 2). New York – Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1993. viii-204 p. 14 × 21,5. \$10.95

Lee, Dorothy A., *The Symbolic Narratives of the Fourth Gospel*. The Interplay of Form and Meaning (JSNT Supplement Series 95). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1994. 263 p. 14 × 22. £37.50 – \$57.00

Lohfink, Norbert, *Studien zur biblischen Theologie* (Stuttgarter biblische Aufsatzbände 16). Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1993. 325 p. 14,5 × 20,5. DM 54, — (DM 48,60)

Lorenzani, Massimo (a cura di), *La volontà di Dio nella bibbia* (Studi biblici 13). L'Aquila, Edizioni ISSRA, 1994. xiii-236 p. 15 × 21. Lit. 25.000

Malina, Bruce J., *The New Testament World*. Insights from Cultural Anthropology. Revised Edition. Louisville, Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993. xv-200 p. 15 × 23. \$14.99

Mannucci, Valerio, *Giovanni il vangelo narrante*. Introduzione all'arte narrativa del quarto Vangelo (Epifania della Parola 1). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1993. 365 p. 17 × 24. Lit. 38.000

Mason, Rex, *Zephania, Habakkuk, Joel* (Old Testament Guides). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1994. 132 p. 14 × 22. £5.00

Mateos, Juan – Camacho, Fernando, *El Evangelio de Marcos*. Análisis lingüístico y comentario exegético – Vol. I. Córdoba, Ediciones El Almendro, 1993. xi-570 p. 15 × 23,5

Matthews, Victor H. – Benjamin, Don C., *Social World of Ancient Israel 1250 - 587 BCE*. Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 1993. xxiii-327 p. 15,5 × 23,5

Metzger, Bruce M. – Coogan, Michael D. (eds.), *The Oxford Companion to the Bible*. New York – Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1993. xxi-874 p. 17 × 24. £30.00

Meynet, Roland, *Passion de notre Seigneur Jésus Christ selon les évangiles synoptiques* (Lire la Bible 99). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1993. 232 p. 11,5 × 18. FF 100

Morreale, Margherita, *La "Bibbia di Ferrara" 450 anni dopo la sua pubblicazione* (Memorie, Serie 9, Vol. 4, fasc. 3). Roma, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 1994. 50 p. 17 × 24. Lit. 9.000

O'Collins, Gerald, SJ, *Retrieving Fundamental Theology*. The Three Styles of Contemporary Theology. New York – Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1993. iii-225 p. 15 × 23. \$19.95

Ord, David Robert – Coote, Robert B., *Is the Bible TRUE?* Understanding the Bible Today. Maryknoll, Orbis Books, 1994. xii-132 p. 13,5 × 21. \$9.95

Péter-Contesse, René – Ellington, John, *A Handbook on the Book of Daniel* (UBS Handbook Series). New York, United Bible Societies, 1994. viii-365 p. 16 × 24. \$8.95

Pilch, John J. – Malina, Bruce J. (eds.), *Biblical Social Values and their Meaning*. A Handbook. Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 1993. xxxix-199 p. 14,5 × 22. \$19.95

Piper, John, *Let the Nations be Glad!* The supremacy of God in missions. Leicester, Inter-Varsity Press, 1994. 239 p. 12,5 × 20. £8.99

Polzin, Robert, *Samuel and the Deuteronomist*. A Literary Study of the Deuteronomic History. Part Two: 1 Samuel (Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature). Bloomington & Indianapolis, Indiana University Press, 1993. ix-297 p. 15 × 23. Cloth: \$35.00; paper: \$14.95

Polzin, Robert, *David and the Deuteronomist*. A Literary Study of the Deuteronomic History. Part Three: 2 Samuel (Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature). Bloomington & Indianapolis, Indiana University Press, 1993. xii-245 p. 16 × 23,5. \$39.95

Porten, Bezalel – Yardeni, Ada (eds.), *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt*. Newly Copied, Edited and Translated into English. 3: Literature, Accounts, Lists (Texts and Studies for Students). Jerusalem, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Department of the History of the Jewish People, 1993. lxvi-295 p. 36 unfolding diagrams. 24 × 34

Porter, Stanley E. – Olbricht, Thomas H. (eds.), *Rhetoric and the New Testament*. Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference (JSOT Supplement Series 90). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1993. 538 p. 14 × 22. £45.00 – \$75.00

Puech, Émile, *La Croyance des Esséniens en la Vie Future: Immortalité, Résurrection, Vie Éternelle?* Histoire d'une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien: I. La résurrection des morts et le contexte scripturaire; II. Les données qumraniennes et classiques (ÉB 21). Paris, J. Gabalda et Cie, 1993. xviii-956 p. 16 × 24. FF 560

Ralph, Margaret Nutting, *Discovering Prophecy & Wisdom*. The Books of Isaiah, Job, Proverbs & Psalms (Discovering the Living Word 4). New York – Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1993. ix-326 p. 15 × 23. \$12.95

Rashkow, Ilona N., *The Phallacy of Genesis*. A Feminist-Psychoanalytic Approach (Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation). Louisville, Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993. 144 p. 14 × 21,5. \$14.96

Raurell, Frederic – **Roure**, Damià – **Tragan**, Pius-Ramon (a cura de), *Tradició i Traducció de la Paraula*. Miscel·lània Guiu Camps (Scripta et Documenta 47). Montserrat, Associació Bíblica de Catalunya, 1993. 447 p. 15,5 × 23,5

Rauscher, Johann, *Das Bildwort von der Öllampe in der synoptischen Tradition*. Eine Auslegung von Mk 4,21f par Lk 8,16f; Mt 5,15; Lk 11,33. Desselbrunn, s.e., 1994. xii-416 p. 15 × 21. ÖS 300,—

Riley, William, *King and Cultus in Chronicles*. Worship and the Reinterpretation of History (JSOT Supplement Series 160). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1993. 229 p. 14 × 22. £35.00 – \$60.00

Rius-Camps, Josep, *Comentari als Fets dels Apòstols*. Vol. II: “Judea i Samaria”: Gènesi de l'església cristiana a Antioquia (Ac 6,1-12,25) (Collectània Sant Pacià 47). s.l., Facultat de Teologia de Catalunya – Editorial Herder, 1993. 400 p. 15,5 × 21,5

Runacher, Caroline, *Croyants incrédules*. La guérison de l'épileptique, Marc 9,14-29 (LD 157). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1994. 300 p. 13,5 × 21,5. FF 150

Sabugal, Santos, O.S.A., *Anástasis*. Resucitó y resucitaremos (BAC 536). Madrid, Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1993. xx-712 p. 13 × 20

Salters, Robert B., *Jonah & Lamentations* (Old Testament Guides). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1994. 125 p. 14 × 22. £5.95 – \$9.95

Sawicki, Marianne, *The Gospel in History*. Portrait of a Teaching Church: The Origins of Christian Education. Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1988. iii-298 p. 15 × 22,8. \$12.95

Scharbert, Josef, *Rut* – **Hentschel**, Georg, *1 Samuel* (Die Neue Echter Bibel). Würzburg, Echter Verlag, 1994. 160 p. 15,5 × 23,5. DM 34,— - ÖS 265,—

Schmidt, Ludwig, *Studien zur Priesterschrift* (BZAW 214). Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1993. viii-281 p. 16 × 23,5

Scholtissek, Klaus, *Vollmacht im Alten Testament und Judentum*. Begriffs- und motifgeschichtliche Studien zu einem bibeltheologischen Thema (Paderborner theologische Studien 24). Paderborn, Ferdinand Schöningh, 1993. 186 p. 15,5 × 23

Scott, Bernard – **Dean**, Margaret, et al., *Reading New Testament Greek*. Complete Word Lists and Reader's Guide. Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 1993. ix-189 p. 18 × 23,5

Snell, Daniel C., *Twice-Told Proverbs and the Composition of the Book of Proverbs*. Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 1993. xiii-146 p. 22 × 29. \$32.50

Staquet, David, *Anthologie européenne de littérature chrétienne* (Cahiers du Centre de Linguistique et Littérature Religieuses 10). Angers, Université Catholique de l'Ouest; Institut de Perfectionnement en Langues Vivantes, 1992. 173 p. 16 × 24

Stein, Robert H., *Luke* (The New American Commentary 24). Nashville, Broadman Press, 1992. 642 p. 16 × 23,5

Steuassy, Marti J., *Gardens in Babylon*. Narrative and Faith in the Greek Legends of Daniel (SBLDS 141). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1993. XIII-226 p. 14 × 21,5. Cloth: \$29.95 (\$19.95); paper: \$19.95 (\$14.95)

Stirewalt, M. Luther, *Studies in Ancient Greek Epistolography* (SBL Resources for Biblical Study 27). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1993. VIII-87 p. 15 × 23. Cloth: \$29.95 (\$19.95) paper: \$19.95 (\$14.95)

Stone, Michael E. (ed.), *Rock Inscriptions and Graffiti Project: Catalogue of Inscriptions*. Volume 3: Inscriptions 6001-8500 (SBL Resources for Biblical Study 31). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1992. 248 p. 15 × 23. Cloth: \$29.95 (\$19.95); paper: \$19.95 (\$14.95)

Stuhlmacher, Peter, *Jesus of Nazareth – Christ of Faith*. Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 1993. XVI-109 p. 13,5 × 21,5. \$9.95

Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible, sous la direction de Jacques **Briend** et Édouard **Cothenet**. Fascicule 67: Scribes – Sens de l'Écriture. Paris, Letouzey & Ané, Éditeurs, 1992. Col. 257-512. 20 × 28,2. FF 304

Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible, sous la direction de Jacques **Briend** et Édouard **Cothenet**. Fascicule 68: Sens de l'Écriture – Sermon sur la Montagne. Paris, Letouzey & Ané, Éditeurs, 1993. Col. 513-768. 20 × 28,2. FF 310

Swain, Lionel, *Reading the Easter Gospels* (Good News Studies 35). Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 1993. 131 p. 13,5 × 21. \$9.95 – £7.50

Talshir, Zipora, *The Alternative Story of the Division of the Kingdom*. 3 Kingdoms 12:24a-z (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 6). Jerusalem, Simor Ltd., 1993. 319 p. 14 × 21. \$27.00

Talstra, E., *Solomon's Prayer*. Synchrony and Diachrony in the Composition of I Kings 8,14-61 (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 3). Kampen, Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1993. 306 p. 15 × 23. Dfl 59.90

Tardieu, Michel (ed.), *La formation des canons scripturaires* (Patrimoines). Centre d'Études des Religions du Livre. Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1993. 248 p. 14,5 × 23,5. FF 150

Tarocchi, Stefano, *Il Dio Longanime*. La longanimità nell'epistolario paolino (RivBSup 28). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1993. 176 p. 16 × 24. Lit. 24.000

Taylor, J. Glen, *Yahweh and the Sun*. Biblical and Archaeological Evidence for Sun Worship in Ancient Israel (JSOTSS 111). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1993. 308 p. 14 × 22. £40.00 – \$60.00

Le Temps de la Lecture. Exégèse biblique et sémiotique (LD 155). Recueil d'hommages pour Jean Delorme. Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1993. 391 p. 13,5 × 21,5. FF 250

Theissen, Gerd, *La porta aperta*. Variazioni bibliche («Meditazioni bibliche»). Torino, Claudiana Editrice, 1993. 215 p. 15 × 21. Lit. 28.000

Tiller, Patrick A., *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of I Enoch* (SBL Early Judaism and its Literature 4). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1993. XII-430 p. 15,5 × 23. Cloth: \$39.95 (\$24.95); paper: \$24.95 (\$16.95)

Toews, Wesley I., *Monarchy and Religious Institution in Israel under Jeroboam I* (SBLMS 47). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1993. ix-197 p. 14 × 21,5. Cloth: \$44.95 (\$27.95); paper: \$27.95 (\$19.95)

Toribio Cuadrado, José Fernando, «*El Viniente*». Estudio exegético y teológico del verbo *EPXEZΘAI en la literatura joánica (Monografías de la Revista «Mayéutica» 1). Marcilla, Mayéutica, 1993. 556 p. 17 × 24

Tsafir, Yoram (ed.), *Ancient Churches Revealed*. Jerusalem, Israel Exploration Society, 1993. xi-358 p. 21 × 27,5. \$40.00 (\$30.00)

Ussishkin, David, *The Village of Silwan*. The Necropolis from the Period of the Judean Kingdom. Jerusalem, Israel Exploration Society – Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1993. xi-364 p. 21 × 27,5. \$48.00 (\$36.00)

Van Der Toorn, Karel, *From her Cradle to her Grave*. The Role of Religion in the Life of the Israelite and the Babylonian Woman (The Biblical Seminar 23). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1994. 155 p. 14 × 22. £12.50 – \$18.50

van der Woude, A.S. (ed.), *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings* (BETL 106). Leuven, University Press, 1993. xviii-547 p. 16 × 24,5. FB 3000

Van Oyen, Geert, *De studie van de Marcusredactie in de twintigste eeuw* (Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse der Letteren 147). Brussel, Paleis der Academiën, 1993. 397 p. 18 × 26. BF 2300

van Tilborg, Sjef, *Imaginative Love in John* (Biblical Interpretation Series 2). Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1993. viii-262 p. 16 × 24,5. Dfl 115,— – \$65.76

Verboomen, Alain, *L'Imparfait périphrastique dans l'Évangile de Luc et dans la Septante*. Contribution à l'étude du système verbal du grec néotestamentaire (Académie Royale de Belgique. Classe de Lettres. Fonds René Draguet 10). Lovanii, Aedibus Peeters, 1992. xiv-92 p. 13 × 24,5. FB 800

Verheij, Arian J.C., *Grammatica Digitalis I*. The Morphological Code in the "Werkgroep Informatica" Computer Text of the Hebrew Bible (Applicatio 11). Amsterdam, VU University Press, 1994. 88 p. 16 × 23,5. £13.00 – \$20.00

Vetus Latina. Gemeinnützige Stiftung zur Förderung der Herausgabe einer vollständigen Sammlung aller erhaltenen Reste der altlateinischen Bibelübersetzung aus Handschriften und Zitaten bei alten Schriftstellern. 37. Arbeitsbericht der Stiftung. 26. Bericht des Instituts. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 1993. 63 p. 15 × 21

Vetus Latina. *Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel*. 11/2. *Sirach (Ecclesiasticus)*. 5. Lieferung Sir 7,30–11,35. Hrsg. Walter Thiele. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 1993. pp. 321-400. 24 × 32

Vetus Latina. *Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel*. 12. *Esaias*. Fascicule 9. Is 30,15–35,5. Ed. Roger Gryson. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 1993. pp. 641-720. 24 × 32

Vetus Latina. *Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel*. 12. *Esaias*. Fascicule 10. Is 35,5–39,8. Ed. Roger Gryson. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 1993. pp. 721-795. 24 × 32

Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. 12 (Pars II). *Esaias*. Fascicule 1. Introduction: Les Manuscrits. Ed. Roger Gryson. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 1993. pp. 801-880. 24 × 32

Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. 12 (Pars II). *Esaias*. Fascicule 2. Introduction: Les Manuscrits (suite et fin) Is 40,1—41,20. Ed. Roger Gryson. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 1994. pp. 881-960. 24 × 32

Vidal Manzanares, César, *Diccionario de patristica (s. I-IV)* (Diccionarios). Estella, Editorial Verbo Divino, 1993. 247 p. 10,5 × 21,5. Ptas 1.150

Vita Sanctae Hildegardis (Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 126). Cura et Studio Monicae Klaes. Turnhout, Brepols, 1993. 224*-124 p. 16 × 26

Vogtler, David, *Notizen zur Phonologie des Bibelhebräischen* (Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament 36). St. Ottilien, EOS Verlag, 1992. XII-132 p. 15 × 23,5. DM 24,80 – ÖS 190,—

Voss, Jens, *Die Menora*. Gestalt und Funktion des Leuchters im Tempel zu Jerusalem (OBO 128). Freiburg, Universitätsverlag – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993. 112 p. 16 × 23,5. SFr 34,—

Walfish, Barry Dov, *Esther in Mediaeval Garb*. Jewish Interpretation of the Book of Esther in the Middle Ages (SUNY Studies in Judaica). Albany, State University of New York Press, 1993. xiv-386 p. 15,5 × 23,5. \$23.95

Webb, William J., *Returning Home*. New Covenant and Second Exodus as the Context for 2 Corinthians 6.14–7.1 (JSNTSS 85). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1993. 247 p. 14 × 22. £30.00 – \$50.00

Wehrle, Josef, *Spruchwort und Weisheit*. Studien zur Syntax und Semantik der *šōb* ... *min*-Sprüche im Buch der Sprichwörter (Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament 38). St. Ottilien, EOS Verlag, 1993. XII-270 p. 15 × 21. DM 38,— – ÖS 320,—

Wellhausen, Julius, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (Scholars Press Reprints and Translations Series). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1994. xvi-552 p. 16 × 21,5. \$44.95 (\$29.95)

Weren, Wim, *Intertextualiteit en bijbel*. Kampen, Uitgeverij Kok, 1993. 262 p. 14 × 21,5

Wevers, John William, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (SBLSCS 35). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1993. xxv-880 p. 14 × 21,5. Cloth: \$59.95 (\$39.95); paper: \$39.95 (\$29.95)

Wink, Walter, *Cracking the Gnostic Code*. The Powers in Gnosticism (SBLMS 46). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1993. xi-66 p. 15 × 23. Cloth: \$29.95 (\$19.95); paper: \$19.95 (\$14.95)

ISSN 0006-0887

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa

Finito di stampare il 16 dicembre 1994
 Tipografia Poliglotta della Pontificia Università Gregoriana
 Piazza della Pilotta, 4 – 00187 Roma